JUN 23 '50
DUPLICATE

Christianity and Society

The Christian Witness in the Economic Order

A. E. Young

The Peril of Our Foreign Policy

Reinhold Niebuhr

The Common Convictions of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians

A. T. Mollegen

An Interpretation of Human Nature

Herman Reissig

SPRING 1943 **25 CENTS**

Volume 8 Spring 1943 Number 2

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

A Quarterly devoted to Christianity and Social Reconstruction
PUBLISHED BY THE FELLOWSHIP OF SOCIALIST CHRISTIANS

This magazine is maintained through a modest subscription list and with the help of some contributions from interested friends. It requires a subsidy of $200 per year. If you believe that it makes a contribution to the religious thought of our day we would welcome contributions for its support. Also we are always glad to have names of prospective subscribers.

The editor will leave shortly for a trip to Great Britain and the next (summer) issue will therefore be devoted to European affairs. It will contain articles from some of our British collaborators as well as his editorials on the British situation.

EDITOR
REINHOLD NIEBUHR

EDITORIAL BOARD
EDUARD HEIMANN CLIFFORD STANLEY RICHARD DAY A. T. MOLLEGEN
WINNIFRED WYGAL HARRY BONE ROSE TERLIN ARNOLD NASH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FELLOWSHIP OF SOCIALIST CHRISTIANS
NORMAN SIBLEY EDUARD HEIMANN RICHARD DAY WINNIFRED WYGAL
HERMAN REISSIG REINHOLD NIEBUHR HERBERT KING
DOROTHY FOSDICK JOHN DANIELS B. APELIAN
PAUL STREICH—TREASURER

Subscription Rate: $1.00 per year; 25c per copy
4 Shillings per year in England
Published Quarterly

Business Address: 3041 Broadway, N. Y. C.
English Agent: Alan Richardson, Annandale, North End Road, London N. W. 11.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

VOLUME 8 NUMBER 2

EDITORIALS

Labor Has Lost Its Driving Force

One marked difference between 1918 and 1943 in the social climate of the western world is that labor has lost its power and will to challenge the bourgeois order. In 1918 various Marxist parties all over the world were the driving force of a post-war reconstruction. Communism created a new society in Russia and a socialist party took over in Germany. In Britain the first labor government came to power in 1923.

Today there are no really formidable Marxist parties outside of Russia and the Scandinavian countries, where a mild socialism prevails. Communism is no longer a world force. It is bound to the foreign policy of Russia. In this relationship the victory of Russian arms may establish it in the nations of eastern and southeastern Europe. But such victories will be Russian rather than communist. We may be certain that the reconstruction of Germany must ultimately take place upon a radical basis; but we have no idea what instruments will be used to do this. For the old social-democratic faith is as dead as the Weimar republic. It is significant that the British Labor party has no real leader to challenge Churchill after the war. When he announces that Britain will be governed after the war either by the present coalition or by another coalition, in which leaders will be individually enrolled, according to their adhesion to the government's program, he is practically pronouncing doom upon the present party alignment. There are middle class groups in Britain, represented by such men as Sir Richard Acland and J. B. Priestley, who are more radical than the labor party as now constituted.

In America the conservatives have plans for reconstruction; but labor has none. It is furthermore still involved in internecine warfare; and there is no immediate hope of healing the breach.

Conservative plans for economic reconstruction in America run all the way from the impossible efforts to return to a pure laissez faire economy, favored by the National Manufacturers Association, through the big business "planning" of Jesse Jones' "Committee for Economic Development," to the proposals for a "mixed economy" of the "Time-Life-Fortune" group. These latter proposals have the merit that they accept minimal standards of social security, are free of the taint of economic isolationism and even anticipate a certain degree of "planning" at the strategic heights of the economic process. Yet they emphasize the necessity of free enterprise in terms quite incompatible with the requirements of our day.

There are no real labor proposals behind which the working masses might rally in opposition to these conservative reconstruction plans. The closest to such a plan is the report of the National Resources Planning Board, which will become a factor in our national life only if Roosevelt decides to make it a campaign issue. This conforms to the general political pattern of the past decade in the sense that Roosevelt has been the only real leader of liberal opinion in the country.

It is difficult to estimate the causes of this general decline of labor radicalism throughout the world. It has become fairly apparent that labor parties, whether rooted in Marxist ideology or not, have little chance of winning either the middle classes or the agricultural workers. They therefore remain a minority party, representing about a third of the electorate. Furthermore the decay of Marxism as a fighting creed has robbed labor of its striking force. In this connection a recent analysis of the vote of New York city from 1917 to 1942 is significant. In 1917 the socialist party polled 22% of all the votes. By 1942 the party had degenerated into a little sect, which secured just 1% of the vote. Meanwhile the American Labor Party had developed and secured 18% of all votes. This together with the 2% Communist vote and 1% Socialist votes totalled 21% of the total vote. The organized labor groups had, in other words, not increased their relative strength in the city in a period of 25 years. All that had really happened was that most of them voted through a trade union party, without any particular ideological orientation. The original socialist orientation had been dissipated over a period of 25 years.

The dissipation of Marxist dogmatism is not necessarily a loss to labor or to democracy. Communist dogmatism does not fit the complexities of the western world; and there is little prospect of any party which is informed by it, leading the workers of the western world to a new day. Socialist thought on the other hand is vitiated by pacifist illusions of the most flagrant type. It is equally sterile.

The general disintegration of Marxist dogma in the western world might therefore be hailed as a salutary development. Ideally it might clear the way for a more realistic radical democratic politics. Unfortunately the disintegration has not resulted in a new and better political creed. This is where the difficulty lies. Labor has found no effective ideological instrument between a dogmatism, which the tragedies of history have discredited, and the ordinary trade union orientation. Mere trade unionism is without political perspective. The best it can do is to act as a kind of left wing of New Dealism. Whether something better than these two alternatives will emerge in the next decade is a question. If it does not we must expect many a reactionary victory both here and abroad.

Churchill's View of the Future

Mr. Churchill's recent radio address, in which for the first time the doughty warrior who had previously dismissed all thought of peace, devoted an entire address to post-war plans, gave a very good indication of the difference in temper between America and Britain. This difference can be defined in three categories.

1. In domestic politics Britain is much farther advanced than America. Churchill's address was obviously intended to

allay the unrest which had been created by parliament's virtual rejection of the Beveridge plan of social security. Churchill contended that it was not possible for the present parliament to make absolute commitments for the future; but he promised a four year plan in which social security would be placed in the proper perspective, that is intimately related to a total plan for the rejuvenation of British economic life. In professing himself a protagonist of social security the Prime Minister artfully made the program of the left more palatable to the right by relating it to the problem of maintaining the British birth rate and thus the power of Britain.

These promises in response of a wide popular demand are in striking contrast to the lethargy with which Roosevelt's publication of the American Beveridge plan, the report of the National Resources Planning Board was received. We do not say that this plan is dead because it received so little support. It will in all likelihood become the great issue of the next presidential campaign. There is nevertheless a tremendous difference between the almost unanimous support for the idea of widened social security in Britain and the indifference and hostility toward the idea in this country. A tory Prime minister can profess his acceptance of the idea that the nation owes its citizens minimal security "from the cradle to the grave." But a liberal President must be more careful.

2. In foreign politics Churchill advocated a solution of the European problem which implied a full and intimate collaboration between Britain, America and Russia. An American President could not go as far as that at the present moment without arousing bitter controversy. He could not, at any rate, include Russia so completely in his plans. This illustrates the difference between ourselves and Britain in regard to Europe generally. Britain and Russia are both nearer to Europe than we are; and they need each other more obviously than we need either. This does not change the fact that Europe can not achieve a stable equilibrium without both Russian and American support. The Churchill European policy is therefore essentially right.

3. It is in problems of the Pacific in which the roles will be reversed and Britain will be inclined to be the reactionary force. By the simple expedient of declaring that the probable earlier defeat of the Nazis made the European problem more imminent, Churchill virtually dismissed the Asiatic problem. Inasfar as he touched upon he was not very helpful. He never mentioned China. He insisted that Britain would reestablish its power in the Pacific after being quit of the Nazi menace. He obviously intends to hold Hong Kong and Singapore. Indeed it is difficult to see how British interests in the orient can be preserved at all without the Singapore anchor. But just how the status quo ante is going to be reestablished without friction between Britain and America on the one hand and Britain and China on the other is not yet apparent. There must be an over-all settlement here, beyond the old imperial arrangements and Britain threatens to be as intransigeant in frustrating a creative settlement in the Pacific as we may become in the European settlement.

The International Situation

After the pro-Vichy policy of the United States Department of State had driven the advocates of democracy to

despair by the recognition of Otto of Hapsburg, by the support of fascist and anti-semites in North Africa, by the flirtation with Franco and by various detailed policies all of which seemed grounded in the desire to prevent the bolshevization of the continent by the support of clerical fascism, the spiritual climate of Washington suddenly changed. Former fascists and clerical "planners" ran to cover. Giraud promised to restore republican liberties in North Africa. Previous reactionary schemes were abandoned. Various explanations are given for this shift of emphasis. One of the strangest and yet probably the truest is that Archbishop Spellman, whose visit to the Vatican and Spain and finally to North Africa had aroused much apprehension among democrats, was actually the chief agent of the change. It is reported that he emerged from his visit to the Holy See with the conviction that the Catholic program would have to be given a democratic orientation; that it was perilous to the Catholic cause to relate it too intimately with reactionary politics. He is even credited with responsibility for General Giraud's first genuinely democratic utterance.

It is still too early to be sure whether these reports are correct. It is certainly too early to have any assurance that various reactionary schemes for the solution of the continental problem have been abandoned. Incidentally the visit of Foreign Minister Eden has also been important in the new shift of emphasis. This visit made it quite apparent that Britain and Russia are determined to arrive at some kind of agreement. Officials in Washington began to realize that the reactionary tendencies in American diplomacy might lead to the "isolation" of American influence.

It has, of course, been apparent from the beginning that Britain was bound to Russia by more immediate necessities than we; that the admiration for Russia has dissolved anti-Russian prejudices in Britain to a much larger extent than among us; and that Britain was by various impulses placed in the position of becoming a broker between ourselves and Russia.

The danger of not arriving at a basic understanding with Russia is still a real one. If such an understanding is not reached the third world war will be in the making. The European problem can not be solved if Russia and the Anglo-Saxon powers do not reach fundamental agreements, leading to a system of mutual security.

It is, incidentally, idle to follow the pattern of thought among fellow-travellers and attribute all difficulties in this field to our own side. The Russian execution of Ehrlich and Alter, the two outstanding Jewish-Polish trade unionists is an indication of Russia's intransegeance as a totalitarian power. The executions can have only one meaning. They serve notice on Poland that Russia is not going to permit any kind of anti-communist politics in Poland after the war. The two executed leaders were strongly in favor of collaboration with Russia. But they were also strongly anti-communist. Russia knew that the executions would shock the non-Russian world. She chose the policy of defying that sentiment. It is also probable that Russia has opposed the landing of a western invading army in either Greece or other Balkan nations. She is declaring in effect that her interests in western Europe run only to the extent of preventing the creation of fascist states. But she wants an immediate hold upon the states of eastern

and southeastern Europe. This reveals a mistrust between Russia and the west which is very deep and which will not be easily overcome.

The Fires of History

1 Cor. 3, 13 "Every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it; because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.—If man's work shall be burned he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

The experience of history is the light of day which illumines the quality of our work. But history is more than light. It is also fire. Our work is put to a severer test than the test of light. It is subjected to fire which destroys the "hay and stubble" and leaves the "gold and silver" stand. The difference between the Christian and the rationalist view of history is perfectly illustrated by St. Paul's understanding of the fact that the light of the day is not enough to discredit or destroy what is not worthy to survive. The fire also is needed. According to the rationalist view of history men need but see and recognize what errors they have committed to correct them; they need but understand the injustices of an economic system to create a new system in which justice shall prevail; they need but understand the anachronism of nationalism and parochialism in order to create a federation of the world and an international community; they must only become conscious of the evil consequences of race pride in order to achieve that unity in Christ in which there is "neither Jew nor Greek."

The real fact is that these evils are more deeply rooted in the human heart and in human institutions. Even if they were only rooted in the institutions and not in the heart, fire as well as light would be required to destroy them. For every institutional form of evil has a stubborn life. It is never destroyed merely by the fiat of the righteous will. It persists until the fires of history destroy it; until it has resulted in terrible forms of destruction in which it is itself finally destroyed. The evils of economic exploitation are not overcome by some simple educational process which reveals the technical inadequacies of a social structure by which the strong exploit the weak. The evils of international anarchy are not overcome by a gentle persuasion which prompts nations to disavow their moral autonomy and to recognize a law above them. The evils of an unjust economic system are overcome only when war and war debts, the destruction of property and the loss of property rights in war-time finally reduce the proud pretension and inordinate claims of "owners." The evils resulting from the moral autonomy of nations are overcome only as small nations are despoiled of their sovereignty by a cruel tyrant; and when great nations yield precious rights of autonomy under the lash of necessity. Then they yield the very rights which they refused to yield under the promptings of conscience alone.

It is true that if history were only fire and no light, all this destruction would have no meaning and would drive men to despair. The fires of history are the fires of God's judgment. They illumine as well as destroy; and the light they shed partially interprets the destruction. Thus nations and civilization may be saved. They can never be absolutely saved but only "so as by fire." They are saved not in the imposing structures which they have erected. They are saved in the shambles of those structures and in the opportunity to build anew.

The shambles themselves are of course not "redemptive." The shambles and the fire-scarred ruins are an opportunity for new life. This opportunity can be grasped only by those who understand why the old structures were destroyed.

It is for this reason that the judgments of God in history can never be interpreted merely as judgments upon human institutions only. Behind the institutions stands the human spirit and the human heart. The institutions are incarnations and projections of the soul's aspirations and ambitions, of its pride and its hope, of its creativity and its sins. The final struggle of God in history is never with these impersonal entities, the political and social institutions of mankind. The final struggle is with the spirit of man which stands behind them.

The judgment of God without repentance is merely destructive. A type of economic life is destroyed because it no longer functions under new conditions. Under new conditions its old virtues may have become new vices; or the comparatively harmless vices of yesterday may have become vicious today. An economic system which sets man against man perishes in the resulting civil war. An international system, or lack of system, perishes in the global conflagration of hatred which it unlooses. This destruction clears the way for something better; and only in that sense is it constructive, negatively constructive. Whether something new and better will actually be constructed depends upon what has happened to the suffering individuals who were caught in these fires of history. They have undergone great pain and suffering in the process of destruction. They mourn the lives of thousands of young men who perished in the debacle. They have become homeless and insecure. Their momentary stabilities have been destroyed by the fire; and they walk about either too dazed to understand their grief or else driven to new heights of awareness by their anguish.

Whether it is the one or the other effect, makes all the difference from the standpoint of redemption. The dazed and dull grief, the numbness of mind and heart which the destruction may cause is actually the "sorrow of this world," which means despair. The more acute awareness, the new understanding of the deeper meaning of life and history, which sorrow and pain may prompt is the "sorrow of God" which "worketh repentance."

There can be no true repentance if disaster is not interpreted in the light of the faith which sees the judgments of God in the vicissitudes of history. That is why profound preaching is so important in times of crisis. The disasters of history, without faith, usually produce despair. In socio-economic terms despair may express itself in various forms of hysterical politics which would fasten the same fascism upon us against which we contended in the foe. But even preaching the word of God will not produce repentance if the judgments of history have not been severe enough to shatter the soul. That is why America stands in special peril in this crisis-epoch of history.

We will have been involved in the destruction and judgment; but not as absolutely as other nations. This war has not meant a war of survival for us. Our comforts have been restricted and our luxuries destroyed. We may, before it is over, have a large casualty list. But we will not have any bombed cities; and we will not know any of the more terrible forms of judgment by direct exper-

ience. As a consequence America may well become economically the most conservative nation in the post-war world; and it may also be most reluctant to accept responsibility for the creation of a real community of nations. The only possibility out of this dismal prospect is that both our lay and our Christian preaching will be profound and searching enough to make the total judgment which has occurred in our generation meaningful, despite the fact that it has not struck us in full force. That is the monumental task which prophecy faces in our America.

The Problems of a Bourgeois Society

It has been a common place of Marxist criticism of bourgeois society to regard the problems of this era as primarily the consequences of a property system which bred injustice by the private ownership of what is essentially social. More politically minded critics of our era have, on the other hand, ascribed our difficulties primarily to the system of nationalism. They have held that the absolute sovereignty of nations was incompatible with the economic interdependence of a technical age. Both of these diagnoses of our ill are correct as far as they go. And in as far as they are correct they point to long decades of trials before our civilization will achieve a measure of stability and peace. For it is quite apparent that even victory over fascism will not solve the problem of achieving either an adequate property system or an international system in which the sovereignty of nations will have been sufficiently abridged. The best we may hope for is a peace in which we will have taken a few halting steps in the direction of the goal.

Yet these criticisms of a bourgeois age do not comprehend all our problems. They deal with the more obvious roots of our social mal-adjustments. But they do not touch deeper problems of a technical age. In a sense the inadequacies of our economic and political institutions are but facets of a more inclusive difficulty of our culture. The inclusive characteristic of our age is the effect of machines upon human character and human relations. This effect is almost universally deleterious and can become creative only after decades and centuries of experience have brought the machine under the control of human culture. Let us enumerate some of the effects of the machine upon human character and institutions.

1. Modern means of communication, the radio, the newspapers, the movie, etc., have raised standards of literacy without providing any general basis for a profound culture. They have thus produced vast masses of people who live by the shoddy culture of the movie and the pulp-paper magazine. The blessed ignorance of the peasants of other ages, illumined by flashes of religious insight into the mystery of life was beautiful and noble compared with this shoddy culture. It is rather terrifying to hear that a majority of our men in the army find comic-strip booklets the most satisfying literature.

2. Modern means of transportation have congregated vast masses of people in large urban centers, who are held together only mechanically and have no organic means of cohesion. Nazism emerged from these rootless masses and gave them an hysterical form of togetherness. We may defeat this Nazism politically; but we have not yet mastered the problem of the rootless masses. We have not yet found a way of relating men organically to each other. We are there-

fore not safe against the hysteria which may break out amongst them in times of crisis.

3. Modern means of production have robbed the craftsman of his skill and placed it in the machine. This evil is almost as great as the tendency of robbing him of his tools and creating great machines, too expensive for any one craftsman to own. The big factory makes the worker propertyless and thus exposes him to injustice. But it also makes most workers skill-less and thus robs him of the creative satisfactions which men once had in their work. Finding work dull, the modern man seeks his satisfactions in the amusements of leisure. But these are "amusements" and seldom reach any deeper level of human spiritual life.

4. Modern production has created a vast physical abundance. It is a serious problem that the present property system makes an equitable distribution of this abundance so difficult that the complicated system of production itself is imperiled by the dislocations of "penuary and abundance." But even when this problem is solved another problem remains. How are we to prevent men from identifying comfort and physical abundance with the "good life"? How are we to prevent all qualitative approaches to life from degenerating into purely quantitative ones?

5. A mechanical society has produced a general rationalistic-mechanistic approach to life in which the final mysteries of life and death are obscured or prematurely solved by little prudential calculations. Petty prudence thus triumphs over the "tragic sense of life"; and "science," which is no more than a careful analysis and comprehension of all the ordered sequences of the natural world, from geology to psychology, is falsely regarded as the fount of wisdom, with an ultimate answer for every ultimate question of life. It can be so regarded only because no really ultimate questions are raised. Whenever the soul awakes to really ultimate questions, it will know intutitively that science as such has no answer for them.

These are a few of the profounder spiritual difficulties created by the urban culture of a technical age. There is no simple solution for any one of them. To enumerate them is merely to call attention to the fact that modern mankind is in a wilderness between Egypt and the promised land in more senses than one. We are harassed by serious economic and political maladjustments which will require many decades for their solution. But our deeper spiritual problems are even more vexing. Whatever the politicians may say about the brightness of the dawn which will follow a victory of the United Nations, let not the spiritual leaders of this generation give themselves to such illusions.

The Probable and the Actual Defeat

It is now fairly clear that Germany will be defeated; but a year to two years will be required to make the obvious outcome actual. A good deal about the character of human history could be learned from that fact. All during the years before we entered the conflict, and sometimes since our entry, kind people with no understanding of political realities, have suggested that it would be possible to beguile Hitler from his intensions by a negotiated peace. Sometimes they professed to believe that we could appeal to the German people over Hitler's head, though they never ex-

plained how we were to pick the lock to the ears of the German people, the key still being in the hands of Hitler.

These hopes were of course so much moonshine. There was no prospect of deflecting either Hitler or the German people from their purpose, so long as there was a prospect of success. That is proved now by the fact that even when the prospect of success has vanished it is not possible to stop the war until the probable defeat has become actual. History is as tragic as that. No doubt the majority of the German people have long since lost their hope of triumph. But they are governed by a reckless oligarchy which would perish in the acknowledgement of defeat as well as in actual defeat. It is reckless enough to try to avert the inevitable and powerful enough to prevent the German people from expressing their real convictions until the day when the actual breakdown comes.

Thus it is necessary to carry the logic of the situation through to its bitter conclusion. If Germany were a democracy, the popular loss of faith in an ultimate victory might be registered more quickly. But even democracies do not necessarily capitulate, immediately upon recognition of probable disaster. Fortunately they do not; otherwise Britain would have capitulated after Dunkerque. The desperate purpose of a nation to continue a struggle even when victory seems hopeless may be supported by many motives. It may be supported by the hope that the fortunes of war will take a more favorable turn. It may be prompted by the fear of annihilation. In any event most "mortal" struggles between nations continue to their fatal conclusion with little possibility of drawing the conclusion in anticipation of the actual event.

Modern history, if anything, has accentuated this tendency in warfare. Wars in other ages were less "total" in more than one sense. They did not engage all the resources of the nation as completely. Nor did they so fully obsess its mind. Negotiations during conflict was therefore more possible than today. Yet conflict in any age, individual as well as collective, is not frequently resolved without an obvious victory and a patent defeat. The fact that thousands of lives must be lost before the potential and inevitable becomes actual, is a revelation of the unity of history in its physical and spiritual proportions. Man is sufficiently rational to be able to calculate the possible and probable consummation of the struggles in which he is engaged. But he is sufficiently physical to make all calculations vain, until the actual event has enacted the calculation. Even in the history of sin the word must be made flesh.

Notes on the World Conflict

The inflationary tendencies in America are becoming daily more ominous. The conservative farm organizations have successfully challenged the ceiling on farm prices and have added a billion and a half to the price of food. This means that labor will not long accept the present stabilization of wage levels according to the "Little Steel" formula of increases limited to 15 per cent. Indeed the labor leaders of both CIO and AFL can not afford to remain quiet because they have the irresponsible John L. Lewis at their backs, raiding their unions and promising the workers more than the two main union bodies are able to secure for them. If the administration is finally forced to yield on wage stabilization another turn will be given to the spiral of inflation.

THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS IN THE ECONOMIC ORDER

By A. E. YOUNG

Our economic order today, in company with our intellectual culture (and the lives of countless individuals) is passing through a period of terrible crisis. And crisis, here as elsewhere, means Judgment, the making plain of what we have been and are and deserve to be. Christians must see in this crisis, not only an inexorable whirlpool of disaster which is the product of human historical movements, but the merciful will and action of a holy God. In that action God claims us for His completer service, as witnesses to the Light in this darkness, and to the life in this death.

Perhaps, if we could glimpse the full strength of the powers that are ranged against God and His purposes, and the bitter and unending struggle that is ahead, our first wish would be to turn away from life and society in utter despair and skepticism. But there is for us no such retreat from the impalpable forces that rule the destinies of the majority of mankind. Society surrounds and confronts and challenges us, yet it is in just this society and in this plight that God meets and humbles us. As Karl Barth puts it: "From life and from society one cannot turn away. . . . We are engaged in life's revolt against the powers of death that enclose it, and there is something fundamental in us that denies these powers."

The Christian witness in the economic order, which the church and the individual Christian is called upon to make at such a time, is not to be separated from the Christian witness in any other sphere of individual or common life. The dilemma it speaks to is integral with the plight of our whole civilization, and we are given a word to that whole plight, in which the economic witness differs neither in urgency nor in humility from witness in related spheres. Having received the gift and insight of faith through the Holy Spirit, we testify, here as elsewhere, that God has drawn near to us and to our life in Judgment and in Mercy; that the Eternal has entered and is entering into Time and Humanity, and is confronting us with our rebellion and our sin, and demanding of us that we should recognize our sins, that we should turn from them in contrition and true repentance, and in humility and gratefulness should offer up our hearts and lives and minds to be used in His service, and to be renewed by the working of His Holy Spirit.

The attempt of modern Western civilization has been to build a world without Grace, a structure of material and intellectual organization which will be complete and self-sufficient without any reference to the being and purposes of God. The destiny of man as Christianity declares it has been forgotten in the theories and frustrated in the practices of such a civilization, which has justified itself by raising up idols of its own making—false absolutes such as the individual or the state, which are assumed to be

ends in themselves, or roped-off areas of civilization which claim to be autonomous, to have their own non-moral principles of being which may not be submitted to the judgment of any principle external to them. "Business is business" is the common man's way of expressing this idolatry in the sphere of economics.

Against such claims Christianity must witness to the living God who is at work in the world, and to the Divine purpose for the life of man and for society. Man as a child of God is called to eternal life in Christ, a life of grateful communion with God, and fellowship in mutual forgiveness and service with his brother man. Man as man has a social end—virtue and well-being in community, and an individual end—beatitude, and these transcendent ends must be permitted to judge and even to condemn systems which insist on treating man as a thing, or as the servant of aims which work to the exclusion of these primary purposes of God.

The Christian's task, however, is not that of working out what might be called a Christian economic order, in the sense that he proposes a specific form of economics which can ensure that man's Christian destiny will be realized. In no proper sense can we talk of the redemption of the economic order, or of social salvation. It is simply unimaginable to us, knowing with what terrible strainings and difficulties the Spirit of God redeems and sanctifies the humbled soul in the midst of the world, to think that the whole rebellious complex of all men's material dealings, with its historic determinism and its battles of selfishness, should be lifted in the mass and made holy and sanctified. As Barth remarks: "It is no easier to bring society to Christ than it is to bring Christ to society." The world always has been and is now the Kingdom of Satan, and the New Testament tells us that it will be so "till Kingdom come." If, then, we join our fellows in striving for a better order, we shall realize too that that order, when it is established, will still not be good.

The present Archbishop of Canterbury has recently answered those who look to the Church for the specific plans of a new social order. "It is silly," he writes, "to expect the Church to sketch the perfect social order, just because nobody knows, if they are truthful, what the perfect social order is." This is so because the principles of the Sermon on the Mount are the living principles of the divine life, of God's sinlessness, while the social legislator obviously must organize sinfulness—not sinlessness—into some efficient form of relative harmony and justice. "The perfect social order, if it is imagined as the order which would work best if we were all perfect, should certainly not be established, for we should wreck it in a fortnight; and if it is imagined as the order which would work best, men and women being as they are, there is really no reason why we should look to the Church for its plan."

If there is a necessary indefiniteness here, we must not allow it to lure us into endorsing aims for society which, although popular today in social thought, are in no sense Christian. There are many forms of suffering against which Christians must protest, but there are others no less stringent in which Christians should engage. Christianity cannot, in deploring the injustices of present economic systems, adopt as her social goal the loose humanitarian conceptions which argue that all men must be raised to the comfort and relative security now chiefly enjoyed by the middle classes. Social security is not even our temporal

and material aim, for from that concept, as from any state which makes man put his trust in goods and worldly safety, Christ turns silently away.

The Rationalist's Utopia—and we are all to some extent rationalists—is a state of society in which there will no longer be any need for sacrifice and for suffering. The Rationalist can imagine such a state of the world because he has no realization of the nearness, the intensity, and the strength of evil. Against this goal we must raise a Christian social goal, not of a society in which suffering is no longer needed, but of one in which enforced suffering, brutalizing suffering, is not the habitual lot of any large group of mankind. Those who stand beneath the Cross can hardly accept the modern oversimplification of issues which argues that all suffering is wrong; that is no longer the distinction for the Christian. The distinction is between suffering as a willing sharing of Christ's cross, and suffering that is forced upon men from the outside, something that intrudes upon and smashes the individual, something involuntary, inexorable and brutalizing. There may be all the spiritual difference between the enduring of an identical trial by rebellious man and by humbled as there is between martial love and rape. Above all else, Christianity today must not preach the sort of submission which will force natural man in the mass to endure trials which would test the patience of a saint. Economic pacifism, no less than military, is indefensible at just this point; we must as Christians willingly accept sacrifice and pain as the necessary form of love in many situations, and even urge others to join us in that acceptance; we must never accept suffering for them.

Christ alone can enable us fully to accept the consequences of our sin. Therefore, acknowledging the continuing necessity of suffering, our Christian hope for a better order of society is for an order in which more of that suffering will be voluntary and godly, and less of it inexorable and debasing, than is at present the case. The journey to such a society is not clear; there is no forseeable path by which Christians may gradually lead it in, in company with other men of goodwill and energy. This thing is clear, however, that it will not be won without participation in struggle; no class in history has ever willingly relinquished its privileges. The makers of the new order will not produce it by means of discussions round a table, nor will they apply to church conventions for advice about its basic principles. It will be worked out in the concrete situations of today, in the persistent struggles of various self-interested and big-interested parties, in the adjustment to hard facts, to catastrophe—that is, to God's real judgments in history. Many of us today look with more hope to what is happening in Britain, a land of stubbornly democratic habits and not unChristian culture, under the stress of war conditions which have decisively upset the pre-war setup, than to Russia, where the cultural dislocation necessary to revolution has permitted a centralization of authority which drastically affects the whole experiment.

To the church and to individual Christians, then, there comes the divine command, in the midst of the alarums and complexities of the present crisis, to stand firm in our place, and to insist by practice and proclamation on the Christian destiny of man, which the better order must further rather than impede. This witness will include a repudiation of many theories now popularly held, a de-

nunciation of many evils that exist, and an active entering into the struggle of parties, classes, races and individuals by which, even now, the civilization of the future is being hammered into shape. The Christian enters that struggle, not with a divine blue print or as a member of a Christian class, nation, or political party, but armed with the principles of Christian ethics, and sustained by the Grace of God. He sees no ready solution; rather, he knows that the only solution is in God, however unsatisfactory that arrangement may sound to those outside the community of faith.

If we would accept this Christian duty, we must first realize what God's purpose is in any economic order, and how that purpose is being forgotten and thwarted in the present economic order. God wishes to provide through the economic order the material necessities of our common life, to give us our daily bread. Now this the actual technology of Capitalism does with unparallelled efficiency of production, making possible a higher standard of living for the majority of men than has hitherto been possible. Whatever changes come, then, it is not likely that mass machine production, with all its impersonality and centralization of control, will cease to provide the mechanical basis of production. No other system would be adequate to provide for the needs of the vast populations which the machine age has encouraged.

But God has other purposes for the economic order. He purposes that in community men should cooperate (although on the basis of fundamental inequality) in the discipline and joy of work. Our dependence upon one another is in one aspect a necessity, but to the eye of faith it is also God's order of service to our fellows. As Brunner points out, the prophets and Jesus recognize that in the economic order the ethical question of civilization is at its most acute practical stage, and when they give us examples of what our love for our fellows should be, they speak usually in economic terms, in pictures of the practical dealings of man with man. Christianity seeks a spirituality of hard facts, and not of words and sentiments. "By their fruits shall ye know them." It is in the economic order that the clash between the interests of the individual or of the special group can most dangerously oppose the welfare of the community.

Men in society have possessions which have economic usefulness. They own the soil, or the tools of production, or the money and credit of commercial exchange; they own the brains of management or the brawn of the manual worker. The last is the commonest, for it is almost universal, and its possession confers the least power in the economic process. These various monopolies contribute to produce our material goods, each striving to get as much for its own type of service as it can. In the capitalist order there is no body over all which organizes the various factors in production so that the weakest monopoly—that of physical labour in most cases—is enabled to insist on its fair returns in the face of the stronger monopolies, those of finance and the tools of production. To the capitalist has been left the job of planning the individual enterprises of production without any scientific reference to the needs of the whole community and the just deserts of the individual contributing factors of production. Capital tends, therefore, to treat profit as the aim, and labor as one of the costs, of production. In pure Capitalism, workers are no longer viewed as human be-

ings who contribute their creative powers to the satisfying of the community's needs; they become, eventually, a figure on the expense sheet, tools to be used or not used accordingly as it profits or does not profit; they become things among other things.

Now the struggle between such economic monopolies is a tension which seems necessary to economic vitality. Also, profit is in the main a roughly reliable guide to how badly the community does want things. But when in Capitalism the community abandoned economic planning wholly to the man who may be seeking profit only, and who may not be thinking of the community's true needs or the human needs of his brothers for life and work and liesure, it simply sold out to Original Sin, and set man against man, class against class, to an extent which has almost excluded the Christian ideas of community, of service, and of the stewardship of all possessions as a trust from God for one's brother man.

Original Sin is a Christian dogma which is in one aspect pertinent here. The Archbishop of Canterbury brings out its relevance with some pungency in the following manner: "Every man is the centre of his own world, as he sees it. This is true of our mental and spiritual vision, as of our physical vision . . . We become our own standard of value; if things hurt us, we call them bad; if they please us, we call them good. Our standard of value is the way things affect ourselves. So each of us takes our place in the centre of our own world. But we are not the centre of the world, nor are we the standard of reference between good and bad; when we think that we are (as we do naturally) we put ourselves in God's place. . . . Thus we are in a state, from birth, in which we shall bring disaster upon ourselves, and on everyone else affected by our conduct, unless we can escape from it. This is our Original Sin."

Laissez-faire Capitalism contains few agencies which speak for the community, and limit the disastrous effects of our natural state in the interests of the true harmony of the community in its common task of providing for its material needs. Let us as Christians never ignore the fact that, intellectually and spiritually, the workings of our present economic system constitute a major obstacle to actual belief in God and in His loving purposes today. This is true for all of us, however we have triumphed in the battle of faith. In a world which ceaselessly tends to estimate our worth in terms of money alone—in terms of how profitable we are economically (and Communism makes little change here)—the actual bond of life between brother humans is almost disintegrated. If a man capable of good and willing work has been thrown with his family onto the shelf by industry; if he is shown beyond question that he is not wanted and that his life is useless to his fellows, who pension him off on relief: that man may still by some miracle of divine mercy come to know God, and to believe again in the love which was in his creation, in the greatness of his destiny with God, and in the fellowship and joy of human work and service; that man may by some miracle come to understand that, but he does so in the teeth of the facts which have hit him hardest in this world.

Today's Protestantism must take up some definite relation to the class struggle which, inevitable under any system of balanced classes, takes on its most unchecked form in our present society. It

would be unrealistic to recover Christianity's revelation of the depth and intensity of sin in the human situation, if we stopped when we had pronounced God's judgment on the individual life. Original Sin is a class fact as it is an individual fact, and as such it must be exposed, judged and repented of by the Christian, no less than his individual sin. Insofar as the Class War is a fact—that is, insofar as those in possession of the scarcer factors in production use their power to profit by the oppression of labor and management—that fact must be exposed and denounced. Indeed, the Church itself must clearly realize its own natural class bias, and make sure that it is not unconsciously yielding to this in its practices and its pronouncements. As Berdyaev remarks: "It only seems more aggressive to try to change the status quo, than to try to maintain it; when things as they are enshrine the fact of class war, to remain silent is not to remain neutral; it is to take sides."

This last deals only with the class war as a fact; but we today must deal also with the class war as a Marxian myth. Perhaps here something which Christianity has always included in the concept of Original Sin, but which modern psychology has recently "discovered," is very much to the point. It is now an established psychological doctrine, that each one of us forms an idea about himself which is acceptable to our moral pride, our self-esteem. This is the idea that we want to form about ourselves and our relations with our fellows and our environment. It amounts to this, that our fear, envy, hatred, desire and pride take by way of compensation and disguise the form of something quite bearable to ourselves and respectable to others. Now this habit also has its class form, and issues in class self-righteousness. What is said above makes it clear that the upper classes and the bourgeois must have this bubble of complacency pricked, by being confronted with their complicity in producing such evils as war, malnutrition, chronic unemployment, and wretched housing. But the Marxianism which today is taking such a hold on the popular imagination contains a myth of Class War which is the proletarian form of this class righteousness. To a childishly superficial analysis of class exploitation, in which the capitalist and bourgeois are libellously given consciously criminal motives for their part in the economic order, there is joined the view of the proletariat as the true Israel, a Messianic class which will, in an apocalyptic orgy of demonic hatred and violence, forcibly subdue the other classes, and usher in the perfect age. Against this notion, which will be a factor to reckon with in future change, the Church must raise her protest, insisting that the upper classes are also human and necessary, and that the proletariat itself is in especial need of redemption from oppressiveness and sin, particularly if it now is to wield political power for the first time, and be subjected to the subtle and terrible temptations which come with that power.

This Christian witness, let us not forget, includes the duty to judge every class, as well as to champion the just claims of every class. And perhaps no other part of the Church's message could so reassure a suspicious world of the vigilance and clearsightedness of God's men and women today, in their facing of evil, as this sincere, humble yet outraged confession of God at work in the economic order.

THE PERILS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

By REINHOLD NIEBUHR

The immediate stability of any peace settlement after a war depends upon the ability of the coalition of powers which brought the war to a triumphant conclusion, to outlast the conflict. The victory of a coalition proves it to have prepondenant power in the area of conflict. The victory of a coalition in a global war furnishes the proof that such a coalition has the preponderant power necessary to maintain order in a world community. A victory for the United Nations is herefore also the embryo of a world community. Ultimately, of course, a permanent peace must rest upon the achievements of constitutional justice as well as upon the coalescence of powers so formidable that no one can defy it with impunity. The problem of justice is finally more important than the problem of order; but not immediately so. The instruments of justice can function only within a framework of order.

The immediate prospects of a relatively permanent peace after this war are obviously dependent upon the possibility of giving a degree of permanence to the coalition which will have brought the war to a triumphant conclusion. The present war became inevitable the moment the coalition which won the last war fell apart through the semi-withdrawal of Britain and the total withdrawal of America. This left France with the task of seeking to maintain an uneasy hegemony upon the continent with the help of smaller nations allied to her. The very hopelessness of the task betrayed France into an hysterical mood which aggravated, rather than allayed, her difficulties.

These considerations reveal the importance of the present world political situation and more particularly the urgency of the difficult task of creating bonds between the "United Nations" which will outlast the conflict. The United Nations, as now constituted are practically identical with the group of powers which realistic statesman had regarded as the possible instruments of "collective security" before the war. This is to say that the coalition which seems destined to win the war could also have prevented the conflict had it come into being by the exercise of political foresight rather than in the exigencies of the conflict itself. It had sufficient power so that even the most foolhardy aggressors would not have dared to defy it. Unfortunately the aggressors were able to count on its lack of unity and therefore plausibly hoped to be able to make their venture with impunity.

Naturally a coalition which lacked sufficient affinities of purpose to anticipate the situation in which it now finds itself, does not offer too much hope of permanence beyond the war. Therein lies the peril of our present situation. On the other hand our position is not hopeless if we have the wit to learn the lessons which the conflict has taught us. Though the war has taught us the neces-

sity of some such coalition, the conflict itself unfortunately does not give us the imagination to overcome the points of friction which threaten to divide us again. The common perils of a desperate war of survival may indeed prompt a momentary coalescence of power; but they do not guarantee that the unity will survive the crisis which produces it. A more permanent union of these forces requires an imaginative statesmanship. Such a statesmanship must exploit the opportunities and necessities of mutual relations in the conflict itself and use them as a foundation for building a structure of international accord which will outlast the conflict. The sources of actual and potential friction between the allies in the conflict are sufficient to discourage any timid statesmanship and to tempt an unrealistic type of statemanship to take refuge in political abstractions. We will succeed in building an alliance which will outlast the war only if it is firmly recognized that it offers the only basis for a permanent peace.

It is because of these considerations that the present policies of the American state department must fill the astute observer with forebodings of disaster. Our post-war relations with Britain will be difficult enough. We have done little to anticipate and resolve the frictions which will arise between us. But they are as nothing compared to the difficulties of achieving a tolerable accord between ourselves and Russia. Even if a generation of ideological controversy had not divided the socalled democratic world and Russia it would be difficult to persuade nations, each of which had been reluctantly thrown into a common struggle (by a German attack upon Russia and a Japanese attack upon America) that their future security depends upon common and mutual policies. Even if Russia were no more than Russia and America no more than another nation, on the other side of the world, it would be difficult to work out a common policy against the inclination of Russia to seek security by territorial arrangements in the area contiguous to it, and against the inclination of America to exploit its dominant power, as the strongest industrial nation of the world, in an effort to win security by itself. These inclinations are natural enough but they are also doomed to failure ; for there can be no unilateral security in a world which modern technology has made almost insufferably intimate and interdependent.

But unfortunately these difficulties are small compared with the difficulties, created by the ideological controversy between Russia and the west, more particularly between Russia and America. We will undoubtedly emerge from the conflict as the only strong nation with a considerable economic margin in an impoverished world. We will therefore be inclined, more than any other nation, to identify democracy with the free play of economic enterprise which has been the achievement, the luxury and the vice of the period of bourgeois glory. Russia on the other hand is the first nation of history to have applied the Marxist dogma rigorously and to have socialized (nationalized) all property. In the process of doing this it suppressed liberty as well as property. It thereby proved the defect in the Marxist dogma; and there is no reason why genuine lovers of democracy should hide this defect, though the faithful Marxists will seek to obscure it by illusory hopes of an automatic withering away of the state. In between these two powerful nations, one of which tends falsely to identify liberty

with the rights of property and the other of which has falsely destroyed liberty with the nationalization of property, there lies an impoverished continent in which there is neither liberty nor property. The organization of the economic and political life of this continent represents the potential source of friction between America and Russia. To the north of the continent, more deeply involved in it than America, but less deeply than Russia, is Britain, ideologically closer to America than to Russia but strategically closer to Russia than to America. It is also closer to Russia politically because the two need each other more desperately in the post-war period than we need either the one or the other.

We may assume that the people of the continent have had enough of tyranny to have conceived a passionate desire for liberty. This means that they would prefer something else than either communist or fascist totalitarianism. The peoples of western Europe will probably have a particular fear of communism, not so much on economic grounds but because communist dogmas tend to destroy hallowed and hereditary cultural traditions. The peoples of eastern Europe, on the other hand, will probably have a sense of ethnic (that is Slavic) affinity with Russia which would outweigh this cultural consideration. But in either case, the peoples of Europe are potential democrats. It is quite certain, however, that there is no possibility of setting up a property system among them, faintly corresponding to the American system of free enterprise. This applies not only to the smaller nations which are involvel in a decadent feudalism but to Germany and France in which the war has functioned as a vast meat-chopper which has torn the previous property systems into shreds, beyond all hope of restitution along traditional lines.

In this situation America could function in the interest of democracy only if it were ready to give economic support to the continent without seeking to prevent the establishment of systems which sought to combine collective forms of economy with political freedom. That is also the only possibility of preventing the continent from turning to bolshevism, as the lesser of two evils. For if efforts are made to maintain remnants of the status quo in Europe by the use of the prestige of military leaders, of long outmoded monarchism and legitimitism, of forms of clerical fascism which are supposed to be "decent" because they are not quite as brutal as Nazism, we may be quite sure that the impoverished people will accept communism as the lesser of two evils.

It is upon this latter policy that our state department has obviously embarked. Though we do not know all the facts, it must now be quite clear that the persistent flirtation of the State department with fascists and semi-fascists, with Franco and Vichyites, from the days of the Spanish revolution to the North African occupation, is dictated by something more than considerations of military expediency. The outlines of long-range planning can be discerned in all the details; and the outlines which emerge from our day to day policies are totally at variance with our professed war aims. The very fact that we can find no alternative to communism in the reconstruction of the continent but these discredited remnants of fascism is a proof of the spiritual and political poverty of our policy and of the lack of all creative imagination in our statesmanship. Yet

we must not assume that these defects represent merely an aberration of our department of state. More profoundly considered they represent the defects of a plutocratic democracy in which many classes, down to the conservative elements in labor, begin with the dogmatic assumption that democracy must be identified with unrestricted property rights. This assumption betrays them into a policy which requires a fascistic political structure to preserve the remnants of a decayed property system. Thus the fear of communism drives the strongest democracy in the world into a covert alliance with the foes whom we are fighting against an ally with whom we are fighting.

The fatal consequences of such a policy are obvious. If it achieves its intended aims it will create a semi-fascistic Europe. The more probable consequence will be the bolshevization of Europe. But in either case the hope of a stable peace with Russia as a necessary partner in the hegemony of a world community of nations is destroyed. That consequence is more important and fateful than either the bolshevization or the fascist degeneration of Europe.

It would be childish to assume that Russia represents merely an innocent victim of this petty and unimaginative Machiavellian politics. Russian distruct of the west, based upon a dogmatic creed at variance with the facts of history, has been as unreasoning and unreasonable as our own phobias. The Russian insistance upon geographic and unilateral strategies of security, involving the rape of the freedom of the Baltic states and probably a good deal more, is a hazard to a stable mutual accord between us. This hazard cannot be easily overcome. It will not be overcome at all if everything we do justifies the Russian fears, and reinforces the legitimacy of their strategy as being an anchor to the leeward in a chaotic world. Thus if we continue to pursue the policy upon which we have ostensibly embarked we may or may not have gained strategic advantages against Russia upon the continent in a possible future conflict. That question will be relatively unimportant besides the fact that we will have made the conflict, for which we are preparing, inevitable. We will have lost the one chance of laying the foundations for a stable world. All our plans and blue-prints for a federation of the world will be as fatuous and futile as were the hopes of the League of Nations, after the alliance which won the last war, disintegrated at the conclusion of the conflict. Such plans will in fact contribute to the possible disaster of conflict between ourselves and Europe. For they will beguile our idealists and liberals from the urgency of the real problem into speculations about ideal possibilities which are irrelevant so long as the real problem remains unsolved.

From the religious standpoint it is important not to deny the obvious fact that Russia is a distatorship and not a democracy. But the illusion behind the idea of a "dictatorship of the proletariat" belong as the Archbishop of Canterbury has wisely observed to the category of Christian heresy. It is not the glorification of power as an end in itself which we have in Nazi totalitarianism. It may be a heresy but it is a Christian heresy, because its ultimate objective is the establishment of universal standards of justice. The Nazi tyranny represents anti-Christian nihilism. We can come to terms with the one but not with the other.

THE COMMON CONVICTIONS OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF SOCIALIST CHRISTIANS

A Suggested Statement as the Basis for Discussion

By A. T. MOLLEGEN

The Fellowship of Socialist Christians accepts the classical Christian faith as the only adequate interpretation of and rule for human existence. Its membership not only concurs in understanding Christianity to demand our participation in political life but also concurs in the following general understanding of the crisis of Western Civilization.

I.

The crisis of the West is at root a religious crisis traceable to the increasing secularization of modern life. The loss by Medieval Catholicism of the prophetic understanding that human history participates in the ultimate Kingdom of God resulted in a non-historical, too supernaturalistic and other-worldly interpretation of Christianity. This in turn produced in the Renaissance the historicism, naturalism and this-worldliness which has led man into the self-sufficient and self-confident religion of the modern period.

The Fellowship understands secularism as a divine judgment upon medieval Christianity while at the same time it understands the catastrophes of contemporary history as a divine judgment upon modern secularism. The fundamental principle, therefore, which binds the Fellowship together is theological and religious. In terms of the New Testament symbol, *The Kingdom of God,* our theological outlook may be described by five statements:

(1) The Kingdom of God is God's sway not man's and is expressed in history to the fullest possible degree only where Christian worship opens society to the Kingdom's transformations. The Fellowship is first a *Christian* Fellowship. Insomuch as it is Christian it has, as part of the true Church, the ultimate criterion of judgment. "Know ye not that ye shall judge angels."

(2) The Kingdom of God claims all human and material realities and is as relevant to man's social structures, political and economic systems and use of the resources of the earth as it is to his personal morality.

(3) The Kingdom of God always encounters daemonic opposition in human history and sinful enmity in the individual personality. This opposition may be overcome and bound but not annihilated. In mythological terms Satan may be bound in God's power but not so that he cannot be unloosed. He threatens even the Millennium (Rev. 20:1-3).

The consummation of the Kingdom of God, therefore, lies beyond history yet includes history. The symbol for this

is that of God's miraculous transfiguration of nature, faithful man and society at the end of history. This is the meaning of the creedal affirmation, "I believe in the resurrection of the body."

Insomuch as the Kingdom of God is expressed in history, it is the Kingdom of Christ and is received in faith and maintained in struggle. To understand this is to be saved from pessimism on the one hand and from trust in progress on the other.

Insomuch as the Kingdom of God is transcendent, it judges every expression of itself in Church and society and asks for a new decision and a new expression. To understand this is to be protected from ecclesiasticism, Utopianism and perfectionism.

(4) The Kingdom of God destroys, affirms and transforms all human achievement. A particular period of history is always experiencing this three-fold relationship to the Kingdom yet any one or two of the divine activities may predominate.

Insomuch as there is human rejection of the Kingdom, the rejection is being destroyed.

No period of history is without some divine affirmation else it would not exist.

Every person and social formation is asked for faith. Explicit and implicit faith receives transformation so that a new expression of the Kingdom appears. Openness to the judgments and transformations of the ingressing Kingdom of God, therefore, is more important than any specific understanding of what the Kingdom demands in a special period of history. Without the first, every society is ultimately doomed, without the second there is still the hope that the Kingdom may find an approximate expression which averts destruction or disintegration. The Fellowship's first attempt is to bring the doctrine of the churches into a living interpretation of our time so that faith may be evoked. This attempt is not regarded as an alternative to the second aspect of our vocation which is stated in the following section.

(5) In a specific historical period, the Kingdom of God is destroying, affirming and transforming special aspects of human historical existence. Faith, therefore, leads us to try to discern what God is doing *now* to our world and to act accordingly. This is a major characteristic of prophetic religion. Insomuch as we recognize the fallibility and sin in our analyses and decisions, we live in the Kingdom of God transcendent and the true Church on earth. Insomuch as we judge and act, we live in opposition to, participation in and transformation by the Kingdom of God immanent, the Kingdom of Christ, and are Christian citizens and members of Christian political sects. The Fellowship of Socialist Christians is our sectarian existence, not our Church existence.

Our theology inevitably brings us together regularly for the task of interpreting our time in terms of Providence and sin, a task which is as continuous and changing as history itself. This brings us to our special understanding of our time in economic, political, social and historical terms.

II.

As we see it, the results of secularism are particularly evident in modern capitalism, nationalism and communism.

a) Capitalism. The present economic system has played a major causative role in producing the present war and the internal troubles of the nations. Modern capitalism, by which we mean the

economic system of the western nations as it developed up to 1930, showed itself unable to distribute the products of its mass production. It served God and mankind only in subordination to its service of profit. For it, dividends must be forthcoming or the resources of the earth, the products of human industry and the opportunity for cultural development are not long available to the great mass of men. This is flagrant disobedience to God who commands that the fruits of nature and of human productivity be used for the satisfaction of human need and the development of human culture in accordance with His will. This is a disobedience in which all men participate and for which all are under chastisement.

Capitalist economy, by its inward logic, unguided in a secularist culture, has become monopolistic. Great centers of wealth are themselves in slavery to the principle inherent in them: that money must make money, a principle upon which no other human civilization has founded its economic life.* The great monopolies are absolutely responsible to the necessity of earning dividends and irresponsible to God, human need, cultural development, world justice and peace, and even national military and naval defense.

Our age has seen the beginning of the senile stage of modern capitalism. When the system is not sustained by State expenditures for social services or armaments, it gives rise to great capital surpluses which cannot find investment, in creasing unemployment, under-consumption commonly called over-production, mass poverty, and a strong tendency toward international war for raw materials and export markets.

The necessity for maintaining human existence is destroying everywhere the present form of economy. Economic power for good or ill is being made to serve other ends than the enhancement of money wealth. This inevitable transformation of our economic system creates the possibility of progress and the threat of retrogression and casts the problem of our future into the political sphere.

Since the State alone is potentially powerful enough to force responsibility for general human welfare upon the monopolies of economic power, our destiny is largely to be determined by the struggle for the State which is taking place or has taken place in every industrial nation. In this struggle, the Fellowship believes that democracy will survive only if it is able to embody its principles in the economic organization of man's life. Democracy as a political system and social reality must control the economic system through the State or the economic system will destroy democracy by the State. In the sense of being committed to a democratic economic system, we adopt the symbol, *socialism,* without the acceptance of doctrinaire blueprints for the future which are so often associated with the word.

We are deeply aware that a particular form of economic socialism may be achieved while democracy is lost in the political and social spheres. Western democracies must create within themselves a State powerful enough to curb the tyranny of economic monopolies without creating a tyrannical State. Political Fascism may come as the way of achieving economic socialism or as an unsuccessful attempt to avert it. Both as Christians and as analysts of our times

*It ought to be clear that we are not speaking here of the profit-motive which is a psychological category but of a principle of the economic system itself.

we see *bourgeois democracy* as much more valuable than it is considered to be by any form of Marxism.

In this struggle for a democratic state and society, we believe that organized labor plays a special role which is its vocation under God. In a way more immediate than any other group, Labor's enlightened self-interest coincides with the best interest of the majority of men. Labor has a righteousness not its own which calls us into its support. In America, Labor's divisions into several inimical camps, its lack of responsibility for racial and unemployed minorities, its failure to educate its membership in respect to the political situation, and its lack of political unity, coherence and articulation make us fearful lest it be untrue to its special mission. We must warn Labor as well as support and defend it.

b) Nationalism. The disintegration of medieval culture was followed by an affirmation of human creativity and of the possibility for a good historical existence which took the form of modern national self-consciousness. In the secular period and under some Christian restraints, nationalism was more creative than destructive. In Germany, however, the daemonic power of nationalism has broken free from both the Christian and the Natural Law tradition of the West with terrible results, and in Japan it has appeared in modern technological power without having known the Western restraints. The Fellowship believes that the present war must be fought until we have an unconditional surrender of both the National Socialist and Imperial Japanese governments which destroys the German and Japanese faith in their military castes as invincible superhuman groups. Too premature a peace will not achieve this end. But the Fellowship does not take up this absolutely necessary and just war in self-righteousness for we are aware of the guilt of the democracies which contributed to the situation out of which our strongest foes emerged. The democracies are guilty of political and economic imperialism combined with irresponsibility for world justice and peace. This guilt, however, in no way blinds us to the fact that the difference between the human tradition of the West and the neo-paganism of our foes is great enough to justify any sacrifice to win the war. In this war, we are given a righteousness not our own which does not permit us to forget that we are fighting for the opportunity to take up again the issue as to whether we ourselves can survive as a relatively humane culture.

The problem of the organization of the world peace is continually before us but we have little confidence in most of the proposed plans which are current. A political institution such as the old League of Nations may be of great usefulness in the post-war world but we are afraid that it will tempt the nations into too great a trust in it as the guarantor of peace. All of those plans which look to the formation of a world state with an international police force or of even smaller regional states of the same nature seem to us to be abstract, unreal and impossible of actualization. From the Christian point of view they are informed by too voluntaristic and Pelagian understandings of man and history and too little by the understanding of Providence and sin in human history. The Fellowship believes that the best approach to world organization for peace will accept the fact of the distribution of power which will exist with a United Nations' victory. Each of the four major powers

which will participate in the victory will have a natural and logical sphere of influence by reason of both history and geography. It seems realistic, therefore, to recognize this fact and to seek to make responsible the use of this influence rather than to disguise the actual power distribution with federation facades. Responsibility for justice, order and peace may be secured from the centers of power only by the disinterestedness of their peoples to whatever degree it exists, by balances of power among the nations and peoples which look to it for security and by the support and criticism of the other major powers. The political principle upon which this view rests is that justice and order are secured by the existence of a central power and that protection against the tyranny of that power is secured only by a moral ethos and by a balance of power within the framework of order guaranteed by the central power. It may be hoped that these spheres of influence will develop into constitutionally qualified commonwealths of peoples.

A continuation of the agreements which have been and will be made by the United Nations may be able to provide an international law, a correlation of pacts, and principles of cooperation which will stabilize the peace for the immediate future and safeguard against a four-cornered anarchy. It is clear that the United States must forever forsake her isolationist attitude and policy. Isolationism ignores the fact that the United States is the strongest world power and and therefore that power is used covertly and irresponsibly.

c) Communism. The Fellowship has always been a rigorous critic of orthodox Marxism and continues so to be. This criticism has been religious, designating Communism as Utopian idolatry; it has been sociological, protesting against the machine-informed, rigid, intellectualistic pattern for human society; and historiological, insisting upon a continuous reinterpretation of history in the light of new developments empirically observed and of the Christian eschatology set forth earlier in this statement.

Politically, we view the Soviet Union much as we would any other great power with whom we are allied in a fight for our national and democratic existence. We neither expect of it great altruism nor single it out for special condemnation as it follows its own self-interests. We are profoundly appreciative of the fact that Russia has twice saved the world from what might have been Nazi domination and what certainly would have been a longer and more tragic war than it now promises to be. Gratitude to Russia still understands that, even as Britain and the United States, she fought for the world at the moment that the fight coincided with her own fight for existence. Mature Christians will not give Russian post-war policy a credulous trust any more than it can be given to the policy of any nation, our own included. We will be especially wary of a nation with both political and economic power concentrated in a small group.

As to the Communist Party itself, the Fellowship has always differed from its program in a radical way. We have been aware of the danger of unnecessarily mutilating organic forms of social life by coercing them into mechanical moulds. Our understanding of *socialism* has undergone progressive modification until it indicates a direction of democratic transformation of our economic life, each step of which must be taken in the light of the effort to maintain democratic con-

trols of the State, to avert bureaucracy to the greatest possible degree, and to preserve as much freedom and automatism of the marketing of goods as possible. It is worth serious consideration by the Fellowship whether the word *socialism* in any real way describes our position, especially as that word is understood in America. At the moment it seems to mean for most of us a willingness to advocate the intervention of the State in the economic order by various controls, including government ownership and operation where it seems necessary, to the end of substituting the goal of general human freedom and welfare for the goal of enhancing the income and wealth of individuals and corporations.

The Fellowship believes that the process of change may involve conflict and destruction. We do not believe that good-will alone is a guarantee against the possibility of violent conflict. We do believe that the most certain way of mitigating conflict and violence is to enlist the largest number of the total community in the struggle for a new order. The Fellowship cannot share the optimism of Marxists, Communists or Liberals who imagine that a new economic and political system will eliminate all conflict in the world and solve all of the problems of the human spirit. On the basis of our Christian doctrine, we recognize the inevitability of the conflict of interests in society as one of the forms in which human sin will always express itself.

III.

Objectives:

1) To increase within the Christian Churches the understanding of the world crisis as it has been outlined above and to provide a fellowship where persons who share those convictions may find mutual help in thought, action and problems of our special vocations.

2) To provide opportunities for discussing our theology and our interpretation of history in close relationship to the changing times of which we are a part, thus attempting to deepen our understanding of the Christian religion and of our world.

3) To attempt from time to time in our corporate gatherings to embody our understanding of Christianity in liturgical worship and to make available to the Churches the best results of these efforts.

4) To encourage our members in a self-discipline involving the careful stewardship of time and resources in the interest of social change: a responsible relationship to the cause of the workers, in terms of membership in or support of trade unions and political parties devoted to our objectives; the exercising of responsibility, by protest, example and other means, toward all forms of racial and religious discriminations, unjust labor conditions and other forms of social injustice; and activities in the interest of international justice and peace.

Program:

1) Publication of the quarterly Christianity and Society for the discussion of problems relating to Christianity and politico-economic change, and the dissemination of news about significant activities in the field of radical religion.

2) Arrangement of conferences, national and local, for the discussion of common problems.

3) Financial support of religious work which is definitely related to the social struggle, such as labor churches, the

training of religious workers in the radical cause, etc.

Membership:

1) Anyone who accepts the principles of the Fellowship may become a member by application to the Executive Committee.

2) Membership dues are voluntary. They should be measured in terms of the financial resource of the member. They vary at present from $1.00 to $100 per year, each member being left free to determine the amount of his contribution. Student dues are 50 cents. It is expected that every member will subscribe to Christianity and Society, the official organ of the Fellowship.

Note:

The above statement by Professor Mollegen is the result of a special commission given him by the last meeting of the Fellowship, to prepare a new formulation of our common belief. Prof. Mollegen has, we believe, expressed in remarkably succinct and yet comprehensive terms, the common convictions of the great majority of the Fellowship. The statement is published now in our journal because we would like it to become the basis of discussion before the fall meeting; but also because we believe it to be a significant statement of radical Christian convictions which will interest those of our readers who are not members of our Fellowship.

If the statement is carefully analyzed it will become apparent that the chief difference between it and earlier statements is that it places a greater emphasis upon the Christian sources of our ethical and political judgments than previous statements. The Fellowship of Socialist Christians, has indeed always maintained that Marxism is an inadequate and even dangerous religion; and that it is a religion in so far as it pretends to offer final solutions for life's ultimate problems. It has nevertheless called itself "socialist" because it believed that the immediate Marxist analyses of the social and economic problems were essentially correct; and that the elimination of modern injustices would have to be achieved primarily through the socialization of property.

However, as Prof. Mollegen points out, the years have made us increasingly critical of some of the political, as well as the secular-religious dogmas of Marxism. It is quite obvious that those forms of "private" property which represent primarily social power, and the most potent social power of our day at that, cannot remain in private hands. The socialization of such property is a *sine quo non* of social justice. On the other hand it is foolish to press the collectivist solution upon all forms of property, agrarian, small trade, etc. Moreover an uncritical and dogmatic socialist answer to our social problems is politically unfeasible and dangerous. It alienates large sections of our population from a progressive solution of our economic problems and subjects them to the danger of alliances with reactionary power groups.

Discussion may prompt some changes in this new statement; but it is safe to assume that the statement represents the general convictions of the Fellowship. It may be hoped also that this new statement of our faith will open our Fellowship to many who have agreed with our general approach to social and political issues but did not agree with what seemed to them too dogmatic presuppositions.

R. N.

AN INTERPRETATION OF HUMAN NATURE

A Sermon

By HERMAN F. REISSIG

What do you make of this strange, baffling thing we call human nature? What is man? Is man fundamentally good or is he basically evil? Does he act like a god or does he remind one more of the less congenial of the animals? Is it possible to reach a conclusion about human nature that will do justice to its many-sided character—a conclusion that will help us in our day-to-day dealing with ourselves and with other people?

Let us begin by looking at some undeniable facts. Man is certainly a remarkable creature. Persons have capacities which animals and birds do not have: a person can stand partially outside himself and carry on a dialogue with himself. "I" can talk with "me" and compare myself, let us say, with a dog or a gasoline engine. And when we thus think about our human nature we are safe in concluding that we are quite exceptional and remarkable beings. If we know anything at all, we can be sure the adjective "great" can be applied to man. "Thou hast made him but little lower than God and crownest him with glory and honor," cried the Hebrew poet, and his words ring true.

Probably no mind ever considered more honestly and comprehensively the life of man than Shakespeare. Listen to his apostrophe to man, in the famous lines from Hamlet: "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a god!"

All profound philosophies, all dynamic religions, all the great poets and dramatists have agreed about this: man's intellectual capacity, his power of organization, his inventiveness are unique, not something to provoke contempt; something to provoke wonder. See what civilizations man can build! Not soon shall I forget the day when an airplane we boarded in New York at five o'clock in the afternoon carried us over Chicago after dark. As we flew high over the city we pressed our faces to the plane's windows and were almost breathless with wonder. A myriad of electric lights glowing through the dark amid the vast expanse of office buildings, factories and homes!

Who created that vast city, with its intricate structures and mechanisms, where five and a half million people can pick up anywhere in the city a little instrument and depend on a girl, hidden away somewhere in the vastness, saying, "Number, please?"; where in a million homes water will flow instantly at the turn of a faucet; where every family, however obscure, can be sure that milk, brought from some farm a hundred miles away, will be on the doorstep in the worning; where every housewife with a little piece of colored

paper in her hand can buy coffee from Java, oranges from California, sugar from Cuba; where in every home there are lights that could all, if desired, be turned off or turned on by a few men flicking central switches? Who created this stupendous mechanism and performs this hourly miracle? Man! And who dreamed and then constructed this comfortable ship that, using the air as a floor, moves smoothly above the city and guided by a young man watching an instrument brings us down in the exact spot selected by the pilot? Man!

What a piece of work is man! A little lower than God! Joseph Haydn writing his oratorio, "The Creation," was filled with exaltation when he contemplated man.

> "In native worth and honor clad,
> With beauty, courage, strength adorn'd,
> Erect, with front serene he stands,
> A man, the lord and king of nature all."

When Toscanini, himself a miracle, leads a symphony orchestra in playing the works of Schumann or Strauss, who is not filled with swelling wonder and thanksgiving? The orchestra makes the morning stars to sing together and the theme of the song is grandeur and greatness and infinite possibility.

Consider a second undeniable fact about man. He is capable of goodness that shines like the sun. Bishop MacDowell recalls a little story, published years ago, called, "Vestry of the Basins." Vestry was the wife of a fisherman. One day a party of summer visitors went out in a little pleasure launch. People on the shore saw to their horror that the boat was caught in a squall and threatened with wreck. Vestry's husband leaped into his stout fisherman's boat and with almost superhuman strength rowed out to where the launch was tossing, threw them a rope, and again with almost superhuman strength rowed them to shore. As he stepped out on the sand, his heart gave out and he dropped dead. Then Vestry look at her husband and said, "All his life, when he had anything anybody needed, he just gave it to them. At last they needed his life and he gave them that."

History tells the story of thousands of whom it could truthfully be said, "All his life, whenever anybody needed anything, he gave it to them. At last they needed his life and he gave them that."

Some of you may have read the biography of two brothers who lived in a little town in Minnesota. What most to wonder at in Dr. Charlie and Dr. Will Mayo—their genius in surgery, their capacity for hard, humble-spirited work, or, just their success as human beings? Read the book and give thanks. You will remember stories like this: A boy just out of high school came one day to the clinic. When it was decided that he needed an operation, the boy exclaimed, "But I haven't any money to pay for an operation." Dr. Will looked at him soberly. "Do you think you could earn some after you get well?" The boy was sure he could. "All right, you see if you can send me ten dollars a month 'till you've paid a hundred dollars." Regularly each month the mail brought to Dr. Will's desk two five dollar bills, and when the tenth arrived, the doctor sent the boy a check for a hundred dollars plus generous interest, with a note. "You've shown yourself and me you could do it. Now you can put this in the bank and make it grow."

The story is not exceptional. He has not lived long who cannot think of peo-

ple, rich and poor, prominent and obscure, whose sheer goodness, thoughtfulness, generosity outshines the evil of history.

We come to a third undeniable fact. In you and I and in all men there is a disease, a taint, a defect—call it what we will—that always throws a shadow and sometimes produces such depths of wickedness as almost to destroy us altogether. This fact about man is not so pleasant to look at, but if it is unpleasant to look at it, it is fatal not to look at it. Man is marvellous and good. Yes, and man is tragic and very evil. We have mentioned Toscanini. One night I was doing what one ought not to do—listening to radio music and reading a book at the same time. The music—Toscanini's N. B. C. orchestra—was magnificent, until one wanted to sing, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and the king of glory shall come in." The book in my hand was Jan Valtin's, "Out of the Night." One reads such a book with a kind of fascinated horror. These things, then, men can do to one another! God in heaven, to what depths of cruelty and infamy men can descend! The music said, "Glory!" The book said, "Shame!" The music said, "O give thanks unto the Lord for he is good." The story said, "If thou, O Lord, shouldest mark iniquity, O Lord, who should stand?"

We mentioned Haydn's tribute to man. Suppose, last week we had listened to the oratorio. Afterwards we might have picked up a newspaper and read something like this: "In the approaches to Stalingrad history's bloodiest battle is being fought. The Germans advanced down one street over huge piles of their own dead." And then we might have picked up a popular magazine and read Edna Millay's terrific description of what the Germans did to the men, women and children of Lidice. And all the sinking of ships and demolition of homes and taking of life—for what? On the Axis side, to capture more territory, to keep a megalomaniac in power. On our side—yes, to be sure, to fend off the worst threat decent men have ever faced. But we know that these are no satisfactory answers. Any school boy can ask another question. Why do not human beings solve their problems like reasonable beings? The answer to that? My boy: man is a strange creature. He can be wonderful, kind, brilliant, magnanimous. But something is wrong with him—deeply wrong. He mistakes light for darkness. He is, to reverse the title of a modern drama, heaven-bent for hell.

Our strange perversity is epitomized in a little poem about the airplane and the submarine.

> "Now beneath the waters man
> Creeps, the new Leviathan;
> Now he makes him monstrous wings,
> Mighty lord of flying things.
> Charged with death the vessel creeps
> Through the wide and silent deeps;
> Pois'd upon the awful sky,
> Death's new angel, man, goes by;
> Two dominions, won at last,
> At the feet of death to cast!"

But we have been talking about big events and prominent people. Would everything be quite nice if only we could abolish the big evil doers? We shall have to say, I am afraid, that we are all in the same boat. By whatever name you call it, the taint is in every mind that inhabits a human body. Let us consider some illustrations. We want, most of us, to help other people. That surely is a

good trait. One would think we could always trust it and always applaud it. Yet what tricks the desire to help plays on us! The fact is that sometimes when we seem to be helping others out of simple joy in another's welfare, actually our much helping may be a disguised way of inflating our own ego or of enjoying a sense of power over others. We have to be careful in this matter of "doing good" because always these tricky minds of ours can twist a good thing into something that is not good at all but decidedly unhealthy. Think how spiritually dangerous the profession of the ministry is. Why is it dangerous? Because the human mind is not reliable. The minister talks much about justice, love, truth, self-sacrifice. He means it. But the preacher had better beware. Talking so much about the virtues, he unconsciously begins to think he possesses them, and that the selfish, unloving, untruthful people are in the pews. It is only another illustration of the fact that no human being can escape the treacherousness of our human nature.

We think it would be fine not to be fooled, to have a sharp eye for mistakes, and so it would be. But then listen to some of us give a neighbor or a public official a dressing down! It is clear to everybody except ourselves that what we are actually engaged in is the old scapegoat business, blaming somebody else to avoid thinking of our own failures. If it were not tragic, it would be funny—this slippery, undependable human mind.

Conservatism is a good quality in a man. Surely, it is sensible to hang on to something that has worked and given satisfaction. We call some people reactionaries. But where are the reactionaries? Nobody will confess to being a reactionary. Nobody thinks he is. And this is because the most appalling reaction always manages to get itself accepted in our own minds as a sensible conservatism. That is one reason why denouncing people in public rarely does any good. The people who need the denouncing are always somewhere else.

Cynics who do not trust anyone are right to this extent—no one can be absolutely trusted. Folk who ask, "Don't you think people are awfully selfish?" are right to this extent—all men are selfish before they are generous, including the person who asks the question. Just now we Americans are terribly tempted to think ourselves very righteous. If only the Germans and Japanese, yes, and the British and French, were as sound as we Americans the world would never have come to this pass. The danger is that just because we are, by comparison with some other nations, rather decent, we will begin to think we are above reproach. And then we may end by slipping down to the level of the Nazis whose profoundest ailment is not brutality but self-righteousness.

Without using the word, we have been talking about sin. The popular evangelist does no little harm by preaching about sin as if sin consisted of isolated acts—murder, theft, drunkenness, debauchery. No wonder many people have resented being called sinners. Sinners are the sort of people who tomorrow morning will be in police court. But when we think of human sin, not so much as gross and particular acts, but as a condition that tricks and taints the best of us, then we begin to see what St. Paul meant: "It is a saying worthy of all acceptation that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." Then we began to see why the greatest saints have had the profoundest sense of unworth-

iness. It is when one tries very hard to be intelligent, just, magnanimous that one discovers how pathetic we human beings are. Then we begin to suspect that pride is out of place and that all of us need to pray with the publican, "God be merciful to me, a sinner."

Sin is not a pleasant word. Choose your own word. Call it, with Lord Morley, "that horrible burden and impediment in the soul which the churches call sin, and which by whatever name you call it, is a real catastrophe in the moral nature of man." If you shrink from defining sin in the words of the 16th century theologians—"a deep, wicked, horrible, fathomless, inscrutable, and unspeakable corruption of the entire nature and all its powers"—if such words are not acceptable to a modern mind, we must, if we look deeply, say that there is in us a tragic contradiction, a defiant perversity that, literally, raises the devil with even our noblest intentions.

Someone may say that sin may be serious but it is not mysterious. It is merely animal business which we have not yet outgrown. To which we must reply: "It is something we grew into when we left the animal state. If no animal is capable of man's goodness, neither is he capable of man's cruelty and destructiveness. On that interpretation a civilized man ought to be morally at least a little better than primitive man. But it is civilized man who introduces the primitive American Indian to "fire water" and kills off the Indian, not merely with his civilized gun but with civilized tuberculosis induced by civilized whisky. No, the evolution explanation of sin is a wholly inadequate explanation.

Consider a second explanation. Sin, someone says, is simply ignorance. We can educate ourselves out of it. Understanding, information, the scientific approach—these will in time do the trick. To which we must answer: On that explanation, educated, cultured people ought at least to do a little less damage than untutored people. But the Chamberlain who permitted the Czechs to be sacrificed to Hitler and so made a world war inevitable; the Laval who sold his glorious France for a mess of power; the Goehrings and Goebbels, these are not ignorant, untravelled folk. Those of us in America who watched the conflagration sweep across Europe and denounced the Americans who said it was our business—a little more education would not have avoided that dangerous mentality. Henry Cabot Lodge who did more than any other one man to destroy the first promise of a league of nations. Was he an uneducated man? He was the product of our best schools.

There is a third explanation of what Christianity calls sin. Evil, this explanation says, comes from the body. Progress toward goodness is a tussle between the good mind and the evil body. The flesh wars against the mind. The mind resolves on purity and then the passions of the body go on a rampage and the mind's resolutions are worsted. The Bible sometimes seems to support that view, and many Christian thinkers have supposed that the root of evil is in the body. But when the ascetics whipped their bodies and denied their physical needs almost beyond endurance they proved that evil does not come primarily from the body. For in the very intensity of their effort to kill the lusts of the flesh many of them became proud, selfish, deserving the jibe that they cared only for the salvation of their own souls. Walt Whitman admired the animals. "Animals," said Whitman, "do not sweat

and whine about their condition. They do not lie awake in the dark and weep for their sins." Of course not! They use their natural functions naturally There never was and never will be anything evil in the natural use of physical functions or in physical sensations as such.

If sin were the fruit of the flesh or of ignorance or of too short a period of evolution we could all be optimists. And, incidentally, we would not need the Christian way of salvation. We could learn to discipline the body, keep it under strict control. That is not impossible. We could eventually educate ourselves away from at least the worst forms of evil. And some day the evolutionary process will take us farther from the animal stage than we are now. But our trouble goes deeper. The problem is much more difficult. Let us see if we can find the real explanation. Is it not the very mind that makes man so great a being which also betrays him? Think of a natural function like eating. Primitive man did not know how to enjoy food. He ate like an animal. But neither did primitive man dig his grave with his teeth. He did not overeat or eat too much refined food. Then the mind developed, became sophisticated, learned to experiment with foods. Eating was humanized. We became intelligent enough to make eating almost a cultural act, a delight to the mind. But that very development of the mind made it possible to misuse food, too, so that intelligent human beings ruin themselves with too much food or the wrong kinds of food in a way that animals or primitive man never do.

Love among animals is interesting but no one would think of calling it glorious. Then mind steps in. Mind thinks about love, refines it, humanizes it—until the love of man and woman can be one of the most creative and beautiful things on earth. But the same power of mind that can lift a natural instinct into something for poets to sing about can also devise ways of misusing love and invent limitless evil with the capacity for love. Is the sensualist like an animal? He is not at all like an animal. He is like a god who has fallen to a devil's estate.

That word "fallen"—where have we heard that before? Ah, yes, in the third chapter of Genesis. The story of the Garden of Eden and of the fall of man are myths. They were not historical events. But we shall have to say that the third chapter of the Book of Genesis contains the profoundest explanation ever written of man's predicament. Adam and Eve knew no evil. No, and they knew no good. As the story says, they did not know the difference between good and evil. They were not great beings. They were utter children, capable neither of the goodness that soars to heaven or of the wickedness that cascades to hell. Then Adam and Eve fell. What did they fall from? Not from holiness. They fell from innocence—the innocence of the child. But, like all growing children, they fell up and down at the same time. "And Jehovah God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."

At this point we may feel like exclaiming, "Why, man is caught in a trap! Without the spirit that is in him he would be an animal, but it is that very spirit—or mind—that tempts him to evil."

Yes, that is the fact. Great good mixed with great evil is what gives human life its tragic character. One might almost put it in the popular saying, "the bigger

they come, the harder they fall." Perhaps this sounds pessimistic? It is pessimistic. Has not Christianity been saying for 2000 years that without the grace of God man is lost? Is it not precisely the Christian message that man cannot unaided extricate himself from his dilemma? Left to itself the human mind will go right on devising more beauty, more goodness and more wickedness.

But there is a way out and it can be put in a few words. At that moment when sinful, lost man becomes aware of his predicament, is humbled by it, sees that pride is the last thing he is entitled to, and casts himself in humility upon the mercy of God—at that moment the trap opens and the power of sin is broken. For it is pride, at last, that betrays us. And the heart of the Christian gospel and the secret of our salvation is in the old words: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us; but if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Herman Reissig is pastor of the First Congregational Church, Quincy, Ill.

A. E. Young is a recent graduate of the University of Toronto and now a pastor in Alberta, Canada.

A. T. Mollegen is Professor of New Testament in Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., and chairman of a special committee of the Fellowship to revise our statement of principles.

Joseph Haroutunian is Professor of Systematic Theology of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Eduard Heimann is Professor of Economics in the New School of Social Research.

Charles Stinnette, Jr.

NOTICE

Several libraries desire past issues of our journal for the completion of their files. The issues desired are Vol. 1, No. 1; Vol. 5, No. 1, and Vol. 7, No. 1. Fifty cents per issue is offered for these issues. If any of our readers desire to sell these issues will they please communicate with our secretary, Mrs. Nola Meade, 3041 Broadway, N. Y. C.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NATURE AND DESTINY OF MAN, II HUMAN DESTINY, *by Reinhold Niebuhr.* Gifford Lectures. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. $2.75.

This second volume of Dr. Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures will doubtless become a landmark in the history of Christian thought. Lest this be considered an extravagant statement, we hasten to give our reason for it.

Christian theology has perennially wavered between pride and despair. The pendelum has swung back and forth between a simple affirmation of life and history, and a simple denial of them. Pelagianism and Augustinianism, Catholicism and Reformation Protestantism, Liberalism and "the Crisis Theology," have all been unstable extremes in the swing of this pendulum which has been a constant source of fanaticism and quieticism. Despair of life has been camouflaged as belief in "justification," and pride has strutted around under the guise of belief in "sanctification." Catholicism placed justification at the beginning of the Christian life and made sanctification descriptive of the actual process of the life of a man in the Church. Through the cooperating grace of God, the Catholic man achieved goodness which knew no limit short of a direct vision of God. While the Catholic attributed the origin of his goodness to Divine grace, he regarded it as a simple possession and expected to grow indefinitely in the direction of sainthood.

The Protestant Reformers rebelled against the pride and pretension in this Catholic view of life and set forth "justification by faith" in repudiation of it. Luther observed the truth that goodness never is a simple possession. There is no such thing as a man standing before God without the need of justification. The Christian life is lived, from one end of it to the other, by faith in Divine mercy and forgiveness. The righteousness of the Christian man is thus a matter of faith and not a virtue. It is not a power which man possesses but a lack which a man confesses. By faith the inner man is united with Christ, but historical existence remains under the curse of Adam and continues to run its evil course. The prime virtue of the Christian man in relation to the world is patient suffering even while he rejoices with the hope of the life beyond. Thus Luther countered the pride of the Catholic with despair and sowed again the seeds of that pessimism which regards history meaningless and futile.

The Calvinistic branch of Protestantism escaped this pessimism through a partial reversion to Catholic confidence in sanctification, based of course upon the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and not of "cooperating grace." It thus produced its own brand of pride and fanaticism.

The Renaissance and modern religion which it produced have affirmed life without even the reservations of Catholicism. They have revealed indefinite possibilities of good in nature and history, and have been more than justified in their optimism by the new levels of good achieved in the modern world. Dr. Niebuhr pays adequate tribute to the

contribution which modern faith in man has made to the enrichment of human life. Nevertheless, he sets himself squarely against the Renaissance type of religion because of its blindness to the fact that history is the scene of growth in evil as well as good.

Dr. Niebuhr's contribution to Christian thought and life is his variously developed insight that the good is not simply possessed or not possessed. The relation between justification and sanctification is much more subtle and complex than as conceived by the traditional theologies, orthodox or liberal. The good and evil in life are not simply juxtaposed in various proportions. Good and evil are so compounded that history is a state of permanent corruption. Where there is increase of good, there is also increase in possibility of evil. Wheat and tares grow together in fields of history, until the judgment beyond history.

There are "indeterminate possibilities of good in both individual and collective life (p. 125)." "The insistence of sectarian Christianity that the Kingdom of God is relevant to all historical and social problems, and that brotherhood is a possibility of history is certainly a part of the Christian Gospel (p. 179)." What more could a sane man ask for than the following statement: "There is no limit to either sanctification in individual life, or social perfection in collective life, or to the discovery of truth in cultural life; except of course the one limit, that there will be some corruption, as well as deficiency, of virtue and truth on the new level of achievement (p. 156)." Nobody but a most visionary utopian could object to such a conception of future possibilities. At this point this reviewer is reminded that tares as well as wheat grow. "Some corruption" is a rather weak rendition of the symbol of the Antichrist! When Dr. Niebuhr remembers the persistent "force of human sin," the constant tendency of goodness combined with power to produce proportionate pride, and our inevitable self-centeredness, he reverts to his more profound insight that history does not justify the hope that good will ever almost completely triumph over evil in history. "Jesus anticipates the growth of evil as well as the growth of good in history," and we have little reason to anticipate otherwise. The kind of humility which Dr. Niebuhr describes so well and advocates so persuasively in this book, will have a better chance of realization among us if we do not forget the sturdy tares even while we look forward to more luxurious harvests of wheat.

Dr. Niebuhr modifies the tendency towards simple meliorism noted above when he turns to problem of the destiny of individuals and cultures in relation to history at large. The meaning of the life of persons and groups which flourish and perish cannot be stated fully in terms of the future in history. A Christian philosophy of history is incompatible with the view that the significance of the existence of a person is exhausted by his contribution to posterity. Men and cultures have an immediate relationship to the goal of history. In making their decisions for good or evil, they confront the judgment and mercy of God, fulfill their *kairos,* and participate in the *eschata.* Having done good and evil, they come to the end of their history and, according to the Christian faith, attain their goal beyond history. All men and generations are related to the *eschata* in precisely the same way. The goal of history therefore cannot be stated in simple temporal terms. Persons are related at once

to the beyond and to the future. Dr. Niebuhr has stated this situation of persons with unusual clarity and force. He also recognizes that an individual's relation to God and to his time is more revealing than his contribution to some distant future. This reviewer cannot but feel that if he had maintained this personalistic and eschatological perspective throughout the book, he would have done justice to the legitimate hopes of the race for the future without subordinating concern for the destiny of persons to the celebration of "indefinite possibilities" open to coming generations of men in history.

Apart from being a unique and all-important contribution to the philosophy of history, this book contains numerous insights into the Christian religion. Space permits us to refer to only a few of these. Dr Niebuhr opposes grace not to free will, in the traditional manner, but to pride which sets aside the need for justification and contemplates a straight line of progress in virtue. This remarkable insight of Dr. Niebuhr reveals the obvious: that the great impediment to the operation of the law of love among us is not free will but pride! Christians have always found it easier to forego their free will than to overcome their pride.

Similarly penetrating is Dr. Niebuhr's discussion of grace and nature which have been opposed to each other since Augustine. He repudiates this simple opposition without making grace merely more of nature. He sees grace at once as fulfilling and contradicting nature. Justice, love, and brotherhood are laws of human association by nature and not impositions from beyond. Grace gives us the ability to live by them even while it brings us forgiveness as we corrupt our love and justice through our pride. Grace is the power which enables human reason and vitality to approximate the transcendent ideal of love, and brings about new levels of justice and brotherhood which are implicit in nature. "No sinful self-centerdness can ever destroy the structure of freedom and self-transcendence in man. . . The finite mind has some understanding of its own finiteness. . . This is the 'point of contact' between grace and the natural endowments of the soul. . . (p. 117)."

Dr. Niebuhr rediscovers the Holy Spirit in connection with the problem of the "demonic." When the self is possessed of power and spirit which fails to do it justice "in its ultimate freedom," it becomes enslaved to a demon. Only possession of the self by the Holy Spirit frees man from this bondage and makes the freedom of submission to God possible. This reviewer has reason to believe that the decline of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in modern theology was due to a failure to recognize man's bondage to the "demonic." Dr. Niebuhr deserves our gratitude for opening this new approach to an understanding of this profoundly Biblical and Reformed doctrine.

Those who have been puzzling about the doctrine of revelation will be grateful to Dr. Niebuhr for his illuminating remarks on this subject. Revelation is the word of God which denounces the pride of man and contradicts his pretensions. The prophets of Israel who uttered the judgment of God against the nations including their own were the first bearers of revelations. The discontinuity between God and man implied in revelation is primarily ethical. God speaks because man needs His judgment and mercy. Revealed truth is not a deduction from nature but the word of God

addressed to nature. Therefore it is apprehended by faith and not by probing into "some deeper level of human consciousness (p. 25)."

If this book, together with the preceding volume on human nature, receives the attention it deserves, it will revitalize Christian thought and life in our time; it will give the church a persuasive message for our day; it will exert a powerful and beneficent influence upon those whose task it is to guide us towards justice and peace among the nations; it will teach this generation to its duty before God and the generations of men to come. If ever a book could make history, this book can. It is up to responsible Christians to mediate its message to a world which is being torn to pieces between pride and despair.

Joseph Haroutunian
Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Chicago, Ill.

THE HISTORIC CHURCH AND MODERN PACIFISM, *by Umphrey Lee.* Abingdon-Cokesbury. $2.00.

This book is the ablest general survey of the history of pacifist thought in the Christian thought which has been written in this decade. Dr. Lee deals with the non-pacifist position of the orthodox churches, both Protestant and Catholic and with the pacifism of monastic and sectarian radicals. He shows why the former position is valid for the great body of Christians who feel that they must assume responsibility for the preservation of justice; and why the radical disavowal of war, together with the radical disavowal of other social responsibilities which compromise the perfection of the Christian life, also has a certain validity. Thereupon he analyses modern Christian pacifism and reveals that its confidence in the ability of achieving justice, of throwing back invaders and of frustrating tyrants is a completely different creed from historic Christian pacifism. It has been subtly compounded with various forms of modern optimism. There is little in history to justify its optimistic conclusions and even less in the Gospels. He credits Gandhi's popularity in the twenties as the source of much of this confusion.

"Non-violent resistance, non-cooperation" he declares "by whatever name called is a technique to secure political power or material possession. To see in these a carrying out of our Lord's counsels is to misread what he said. He treated the ends which men seek—goods, power, worldly domination—as indifferent. If it is difficult for a modern man to think in these terms the matter is not helped by presuming that the ends are all right if some means are used to translate force into other terms than guns and swords."

This is an important and very clarifying book.

R. N.

THE TRAGEDY OF EUROPEAN LABOR, *by Adolph Sturmthal.* Columbia University Press. $3.50.

This book is one of the best analyses of the failure of the various socialist and Marxist parties to deal with the rising tide of fascism, in either its early or later stages. The various sources of the common failure are carefully traced. Sometimes the failure consisted in the inability of various factions, such as communists and socialists to come together. Sometimes it was due to a lack of rigor in carrying through the fight against the feudal-military foe. Sometimes the collaboration with middle class groups weakened the power of the labor move-

ment. At other times it was intransigeant when compromise was called for. The enumeration of these various defects of labor policy makes it rather difficult to chart a true course, corrected by past failures, in which there would be just the proper balance of compromise and uncompromising vigor.

But under and above all detailed errors of the European labor movement there runs one tragic and basic error. All the labor movements were too intellectualistic, too pacifistic, too ignorant of the play of power in politics, to challenge a ruthless foe effectively. They wanted Hitler stopped but not at the price of civil war. When he had grown great, they wanted him stopped but not at the price of international war. The divergence between continental Marxism and of British Christian socialism is unbelievably wide. Yet curiously both types of socialism exhibit the same reactions. George Lansbury, a Christian pacifist labor leader did not want to oppose Italy because war is contrary to the ethic of Jesus. Sir Stafford Cripps, who is opposed to pacifism, voted against armaments because he did not trust a tory government to use them rightly. Blum the French intellectual and German Marxists, who are presumably oriented in a cynical Marxist approach to politics, nevertheless agree with each other and with British pacifist and non-pacifists in their futile and fatuous gestures against Nazism. The European labor movement was much more certain than the privileged classes that Hitler was a threat to their liberties. But at every turn they were dogged by conscience and respectability, by intellectual and moral scruples, by inability to take risks, by failure to gauge the evil of Hitlerism deeply enough.

The cumulative effect of such an analysis as Sturmthal has given us is really tremendous. One has an uneasy feeling that the labor movement, which the tories of all nations regard as dangerous, is really a kind of international Mr. Milquetoast. When the war broke out, a young philosophy don in a British university declared to the present writer: "We are in this tragedy because the privileged classes of Europe wanted the means by which Hitler might be defeated but were not certain that he ought to be defeated; while the workers of Europe were certain that he ought to be defeated but refused to support the only means by which it could be done." The matter could not be put in neater form. This book elaborates the second part of the young don's dictum.

R. N.

THE END OF AN ERA, *by I. L. Kandel.* Eighteenth Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers' College, Columbia University. 416 pp. $3.70.

The distinguished author of this book, since 1932 in the forefront of intellectual fighters against both Hitlerism and the educational weaknesses in democratic countries, here surveys twenty years of educational development, ideological and institutional, in the leading countries. The book is richly documented and its use facilitated by a detailed index.

A progressive educator himself, the author does not shrink from incurring suspicion and unpopularity by his vigorous opposition to the policy of his more superficial colleagues, who denounced intellectual tradition as reactionary. As one follows his dispassionate guidance through the jungle of theories of progressive education, one cannot but won-

der at the "educational nihilism" of policies which encourage the child to decide on its own curriculum, if any, with the teacher acting only as an advisor, on the strength of the theory that "growth" alone is what matters, or that "satisfaction" is the only criterion of value; which assume that guidance would produce "inhibitions" in the psychoanalytical sense of the world; that subject matter represent the authority of the past and must give way to "child-centered education"; that the child should acquire, not knowledge but the method to solve situational problems which he might face, by starting his own "research." This anti-social individualism was, compounded illogically with economic determinism, which taught, on the one hand, that the school must rebuild society, and on the other hand, that adaptation to the environment should be the goal to which the child should be led. The author may derive a melancholy satisfaction from the fact that his warnings against such hostility to standards of value have been fully justified by subsequent events.

A comparison between the leading countries reveals both instructive similarities and differences. Republican Germany, the leader in progressive education, had such disasterous success that in her later years educators sought refuge in an artifically delimited realm of "educational autonomy"—a pathetic absurdity. The really great achievement was the reform of teachers' training, which combined wisdom with enthusiasm. France adhered to traditional ways of instruction longer than any other western country; the popular-front minister Jean Zay, who now languishes in a Vichy prison, introduced a far-reaching but wisely moderate reform. England has adopted all slogans of progressive education, but not as a substitute for traditional education, but rather as a ferment for it. Both Russia and Italy, interestingly, were pioneers in progressive education. The Russian experiments were widely hailed in this country as building the new society of new men. In point of fact they symbolized the well-known admixture of sheer utopianism to communist power politics; with the growth of Soviet realism they were abruptly discontinued and replaced by uniform indoctrination. The Gentile experiment in Italy is the most interesting of all, in that it alone was entirely in place, in a system opposing "dynamics" and vitality to rational thinking. But once vitality had done its part it was logical to discard it in favor of what one would expect. The idea of an education without a sense of direction is dead; the social function of education asserts itself everywhere in accordance with the different social systems.

Democracy is the one system in which spiritual values are supreme. Their objective validity, as the standards that claim our allegiance and should bind us in a free community, is what education should impress upon the pupil's mind. Despite the emphasis given it this program remains somewhat abstract. It could have been developed into a more technical examination of subjects and methods. And it could have been deepened in a philosophical and religious inquiry. But neither way is chosen. It is striking that this thoughtful and sympathetic observer devotes, at the very end of his book (p. 376), just one page and a half to religious education, without fully dealing with its many intricate problems: denominational division and ambitions; the failure of the churches and the home to give adequate instruction; the doubt that the school can do it—and the con-

sequent exclusion of religion from education. To this reviewer it seems that an entirely new departure will have to be sought, to meet the challenge of a plainly absurd situation.

Eduard Heimann

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ORDER, *by William Temple,* Archbishop of Canterbury. Penguin, New York. 25 cents.

Britain is the *social order* under consideration in this little book by the new Archbishop of Canterbury. But all of it, except the specific proposals suggested in the appendix, applies equally well to America. The church cannot qualify as a technical expert in all matters pertaining to social order but it must define the proper relation of the economic to the other activities of man despite the modern assumption that the church ought to exercise no influence over secular matters.

The church is related to the social order on a fourfold basis: 1) "The claims of sympathy for those who suffer; 2) the educational influence of the social and economic system; 3) the challenge offered to our existing system in the name of justice; 4) the duty of conformity to the 'Natural order' in which is to be found the purpose of God." Bad housing, malnutrition and unemployment constitute the primary evils which cause suffering under the present system. The social and economic system "offers a perpetual suggestion in the direction of combative self-assertiveness." It is charged with injustice. It is the task of Christianity to bring men to realize that the purpose of the Christian fellowship is to share in God's work in this world, as well as in the next.

The church cannot enter the political arena as a body but its members must fulfill their moral and citizenship responsibilities "as Christians." The church should supply them with principles. It is only in modern times that the church has relinquished its claim to intervene in secular matters. The primitive church expressed its intimate fellowship in a *voluntary* communistic community. No doubt this was rooted in the Biblical principle that the earth belongs to God and that men may enjoy the use of it so long as they make sure that all members of the community share in its benefits. The church, quite early, came to regard private property as well as the state as being rooted in sin. Private property and the authority of the state are protective restraints necessitated by man's sin. Christian social principles must begin here—in the fact of man's sin.

The primary Christian social principles concern two convictions: First, that God is creator and sustainer. He increasingly draws men to Himself by the love (in Christ) thus shown. Second, that man is made in the image of God and that this image is stamped upon an animal nature. "It is not only," explains the author, "that his spirit and reason have as yet established but little control over the animal part of his nature; it is his spirit which is depraved, his reason which is perverted."

The derivatives of these primary Christian social principles are three: *freedom, social fellowship* and *service.* "Freedom," declares Archbishop Temple, "is the goal of politics . . . For it is in and through his freedom that a man makes fully real his personality—the quality of one made in the image of God." Genuine freedom works itself out in fellowship and in service. The economic system must insure the security of the family as the primary social unit,

for "the cause of freedom will not be established till political freedom is fulfilled in economic freedom."

There are many books today which discuss the problems of social order but few which bring the Christian spirit in such clear perspective. Archbishop Temple speaks in theology and his words are urgent. His cautions should be observed if we want both realism and Christianity in the new order. Surely these words can not be ignored in the days ahead.

Charles Stinette, Jr.

EUROPE, RUSSIA, AND THE FUTURE, *by G. D. H. Cole.* New York, 1942. pp. 233. $2.00.

This brilliantly written book, which caused quite a stir in Britain, is a challenge to socialists and non-socialists alike.

Its thesis is that capitalism has proved an inadequate economic foundation, the nation-state an equally inadequate political foundation, of European life; that large-scale socialist planning is the only form which will permit Europe to survive and revive; and that, hence, British and Continental socialists had rather give up their prejudice against the Soviet and join forces with her in order to establish in Europe two or three big political units on a socialist foundation, either of the Soviet brand or liberal-democratic after the Western mood.

The main lines of the argument are not unfamiliar. Industrial monopoly capitalism is of a restrictive nature, which does not permit of full employment. The New Deal policy does provide for full employment only at the price of piling up an intolerably high and steadily mounting national debt. In the many small sovereign states of Europe there are industries which can live only on heavy subsidies, and taxes and tariffs doom the peasants to half-starvation. Modern mammoth industries demand a sufficiently large area for effective planning and utilization; and unless socialist planning is instituted on an adequate scale, government will again break down and war will be the fruit of rising tyranny and a diversion from domestic trouble once more.

There are highly original strokes in the picture. This reviewer has nowhere seen the insistence on a mammoth economic and political organization combined with this clear insight that bigness must be balanced by decentralization and diversity, i.e., by nationality on the second plane, and by the warmth and spontaneity of the smallest groups in the home district and the workshop of the factory on the local plane. It is the latter which are the essence of democracy, and whose strangulation at the hands of the over-all organizations, the mechanized parties, trade unions, and parliaments, strips Western democracy of its vitality. The "Guild Socialist" Cole asserts himself in these beautiful and moving pages.

The author is candid and realistic in his approach to the complexity of the German problem. He argues that the proved inability of the Germans—the protestations of the Social Democratic exiles notwithstanding — for liberal democracy, the absence of any real liberal revolution in this most advanced capitalistic country of Europe, suggests that the form of socialism appropriate to the German mind is the Soviet form rather than the Western one. Throughout the book he is, however, pleasantly undogmatic and ready to admit the possibility of error on any special account.

We want to attach four observations to the book, in the order of increasing importance.

In the first place, while the author is perfectly candid on the shortcomings of the Soviet system and is right in insisting that it did abolish, not inequality indeed but the worst source of inequality, namely class property, he urderrates the special conditions which made Soviet planning successful and are not found in any advanced country. The fact that Russia started from a very low level facilitated planning. Everything was needed and nothing was redundant. Investment in brand-new industries, of course, cannot be guided by price and cost signals—which the Russians had destroyed—but depends on a more or less arbitrary decision, fitted for a bureaucracy. And it obviously makes a lot of difference whether your plan is only to overtake the example of the West in both industrial and agricultural equipment, or whether it would have to go ahead into an unknown land.

Secondly, the problem on the small nation is treated in a cavalier fashion not found elsewhere in this book. What shall we think when reading that "the" small states, including Switzerland, Holland, Denmark and Sweden, the healthiest and most enlightened democracies of the world, do not know how to feed their "poverty-stricken" peasants? The essential health of private property, where it is not class property but of the Jeffersonian type, should not be brushed aside because it does not fit the accepted theory. Democracy, in other words, does not simply coincide with socialism.

Thirdly, the picture which Cole gives of imperialism is equally one-sided. He ignores the vitality which democracy, despite capitalism, has asserted in transforming the American, British and French empires—in giving the Filipinos the liberty for which they so convincingly fought under the banners of MacArthur and Wainwright, in giving Eire the freedom to stay neutral to Britain's formidable peril, and in devising for French North Africa a system of village co-operatives to supplement the big state-owned mines and power plants. If it is certainly true that imperialism corrupts democracy, it is also true, and increasingly so, that democracy "corrupts" imperialism.

Finally, one does not see how the socialist revolution shall be brought about, according to the author. In no country of the world do the industrial workers, in whose image Marxian socialism is conceived, posses a statistical majority. The middle classes are generally as strong numerically and, of course, stronger through their economic functions; and their ideology is individualistic and co-operative rather than collectivist. The two are by no means incompatible if the parties to the conflict recognize that different technical conditions of work shape men and their aspirations differently, under the common lode-star of liberty, equally, and fraternity. But to impose the proletarian pattern on non-proletarians tends to drive the latter to Fascism.

The supreme principle, then, is no longer socialism, with democracy allegedly its mere corollary, but democracy, on the basis of an equality which is not social homogeneity, socializing the key industries but protecting and promoting economic independence in farming and other fields and uniting the two sections, ideologically under the principle of which they are but different manifestations, economically through their common interest in a crisis-proof plan for industrial growth.

Eduard Heimann

WORLD FEDERATION PLAN, *by Ely Culbertson.* Double Day Doran. $1.00.

The plan for world organization, elaborated by the bridge expert, Ely Culbertson, is now in book form. The significance of this plan lies in the fact that it stretches the abstract approach to world problems beyond the limits which most "federation" plans achieve without however really doing justice to the "imponderables" of international politics. The plan is a nice combination of pure federation schemes and "balance of power" solutions for the world problems. It envisages eleven regional organizations in each of which a dominant power would keep the peace. Each one of these regional organizations is assigned a ratio of military power. There would in addition be an international "mobile corps," that is a genuinely international police force, based upon certain "two way states" such as Switzerland and Alsace-Lorraine which could be thrown against any recalcitrant region. This international police force is given 22 per cent of the total military power. Thus it, when combined with the military power of any of the two large units of power, would immediately give the world organization preponderant power. Culbertson assigns America 20 per cent of the total power and Britain and Russia each 15 per cent. Thus Britain, Russia, America and the mobile corps would together hold 72 per cent of effective military power.

In purely mechanical terms Culbertson has worked out a scheme which would preserve the preponderant power of the hegemony which will win the war and yet has done some justice to the needs of smaller groups. Nevertheless his calculations are all too mechanical. He defines his regions in cultural, ethic and geographic terms and does little justice to the economic realities and necessities which underly international life. His assignment of military ratios does not take the military potential (given by industrial power) into consideration. Nations are powerful in the military sense because they are economically powerful, though it may take some time (as in our present experience) to actualize potential power.

There is no reason to assume that any of the nations and regions defined would accept his ratios unless they were forced to do so by the dominant powers. Now is there any reason to assume that Britain and Russia would accept military ratios inferior to ours? It is artificial to solve the problem of the comparative strength of nations by these exact ratios and equally artificial to express them in purely military terms.

Culbertson rightly recognizes that world organization means the equilibrating of power realities and can not be confined to mere constitutional arrangements. But he wrongly tries to bring the complexities of the world's economic and political life into the capsule of military rations. The economic realities are scarcely considered at all; and the political imponderables are given little more consideration. If one asks for instance how the plan would solve any point of friction between Russia and the west, one realizes how irrelevant these mechanics are. The plan does not answer a single question which Russia would naturally ask about the way that Europe ought to be organized in order to create a system of mutual security.

R. N.

FELLOWSHIP NOTES

The members of our Fellowship who are Chaplains in the Army and Navy are as follows:

Chaplain Richard Day is Chaplain with the Army in North Africa.

Chaplain Francis Sayre is Chaplain in the Navy and stationed at Pearl Harbor.

Chaplain William Jackson Jarman and Chaplain Cornelius Loew are serving the Navy, and Chaplain Paschal Fowlkes, Chaplain Charles Arbuthnot, and Chaplain Gregory Lock are serving in the Army.

Chaplain Edgar Prasse has just entered the Naval Chaplains School, which has been moved to Williamsburg, Va. from Norfolk, Va.

Lieutenant Roger Shinn finished his Officer's training some months ago, and Ronald Landor is an M. P. at Fort Jackson, S. C.